DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 772 EA 014 243

AUTHOR Kamhi, Michelle Marder
TITLE Book and Materials Selection for School Libraries and Classrooms: Procedures, Challenges, and Responses.
INSTITUTION American Library Association, Chicago, Ill.; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Va.; Scherman Foundation, Inc., New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 25 Sep 81
NOTE 92p.; Report of a nationwide survey. For a related document, see EA 014 242.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; *Censorship; Data Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Materials; Librarians; *Library Materials; National Surveys; *Politics; Questionnaires; *Textbook Content; *Textbook Selection

ABSTRACT

This full report of a nationwide survey provides data on the range of procedures and policies currently followed in selecting textbooks and other instructional materials, the extent to which these materials have been challenged, and the resolution of such challenges. The survey sample comprised school administrators and library personnel from across the country as well as state administrators in 21 states who supervise the evaluation and adoption of textbooks. Included in the report are a discussion of methodology and summaries of responses to both the local- and state-level surveys. The local-level responses are broken down into the two groups surveyed--administrators and librarians. Individual comments from respondents are also quoted. This report is intended as an appendix to the summary report, "Limiting What Students Shall Read," EA 014 242. (Author/WD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210772

BOOK AND MATERIALS SELECTION FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES AND CLASSROOMS: PROCEDURES, CHALLENGES, AND RESPONSES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard P. Kleeman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Report on a Nationwide Survey
Sponsored by
the Association of American Publishers
the American Library Association, and
the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Report prepared by
Michelle Marder Kamhi

September 25, 1981

EA 014 243

CONTENTS

Introduction i

Table I Comparison between Survey Sample and Returns across Geographical Regions vi

Table II Comparison between Survey Sample and Returns across Adoption Categories vii

Part I Summary of Responses to Survey of School Administrators and Librarians 1

Part II Summary of Responses to Survey of State-Adoption Administrators 52

Table III Public School Enrollment in States with Statewide Adoption Procedures 55

Notes 70

Appendix A Cover Letter for Local-Level Questionnaire 72

Appendix B Local Newspaper Account of School Censorship Attempt 73

Appendix C Letter to AAP from Local School Administrator 76

Appendix D Letter to AAP from State-Adoption Administrator 78

Introduction

This report presents the results of the nationwide survey BOOK AND MATERIALS SELECTION FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES AND CLASSROOMS: PROCEDURES, CHALLENGES, AND RESPONSES, conducted in the spring of 1980 under the sponsorship of the Association of American Publishers (AAP), the American Library Association (ALA), and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

The summary report, "Limiting What Students Shall Read," to which this full report is appended, focused on the salient survey findings, particularly those relating to the pressures on school books and instructional materials. For general background on the survey, the reader is referred to the introductory section (pp. 1-2) of that report.

The AAP-ALA-ASCD survey was conducted in two parts: a large-scale mail survey of elementary and secondary public school administrators and librarians on the building and district levels in the 50 states and the District of Columbia, and a mail and telephone survey of state-level administrators who supervise the evaluation and adoption of textbooks in the 22 states that prepare statewide adoption lists for school books.

In addition to providing more detailed information on the survey design and methodology, this document reports more fully on the survey results. In Parts I and II below, all of the survey questions are presented, followed by the percentages of responses on each multiple-choice item. Part I presents the responses to the local-level survey of administrators and librarians; Part II, the responses to the state-level survey of the 22 "adoption" states.

Also included in this report are the principal write-in comments of all respondents who reported recent challenges to books and materials in their schools, as well as comments culled from 20 percent (randomly selected) of the returns by respondents reporting no recent challenges.

Purpose of the Survey

The purpose of the study was to gather data on "the range of procedures and policies currently followed in selecting textbooks and other instructional materials for public school classrooms and libraries; the nature, extent, and magnitude of challenges to these books and materials, and to the selection procedures and policies; the ways in which such challenges have been resolved; and the ways in which the resolutions of such challenges have affected curriculum content, materials selection, and teaching methodology."

In the past decade, only two other major nationwide mail surveys have addressed these important issues. Both were more limited in design and scope than the present study. One, by the Educational Research Service (ERS--an independent, nonprofit research organization) in 1976, dealt primarily with materials selection, devoting only one question to the issue of challenges to materials. The ERS questionnaires were mailed only to district administrators in 33 so-called open states. Districts in 17 states (those in which, to quote the ERS report, "textbooks and instructional materials are chosen at the state level and which are consequently granted only limited choice in the selection of textbooks and instructional materials") were not included in the ERS sample. Nor were librarians or principals sampled. Of 1,275 districts sampled, 414 responded.[1]

The other recent nationwide survey, conducted by the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) in 1977, dealt only with censorship pressures, not with the initial selection process, and was limited to secondary school teachers of English who were NCTE members. Of 2,000 teachers sampled, 630 responded.[2]

In undertaking the present study, the sponsoring organizations sought to go beyond the limits of the ERS and NCTE studies, to gather more comprehensive data. In addition to broadening the scope of the sample to include librarians as well as administrators, on the elementary and secondary building and district levels in all 50 states, the sponsors also deemed it important to survey, in the "adoption" states, education department personnel at the state level, where much of the preselection of instructional materials occurs for those states (which also exert a considerable influence on the selection of materials in the "open" states). In addition, the sponsors were especially concerned to obtain information on selection policies and procedures, as well as on the challenges to materials, in the hope of shedding light on the interaction between these two related aspects of the selection process.

The design of the survey was determined by the sponsors in consultation with the Research and Evaluation Department of the McGraw-Hill Book Company. In addition, several key educational organizations served in an advisory capacity on the project: the American Association of School Administrators, the American Association of School Librarians, the National Association of State Boards of Education, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the National School Boards Association.

For the sake of simplicity, the discussion which immediately follows deals only with the local-level survey. For information on the state-level survey, see the section beginning on p. x below.

Design of the Local-Level Survey

As already noted, an important dimension of the local-level survey was the inclusion of librarians in the sample population (the ERS survey pertained only to classroom materials; the NCTE study gathered information about school library materials only indirectly, from the English teachers surveyed).

Since the selection of materials and the resolution of challenges often occur at the building level, both building-level and district-level administrators and librarians were sampled. Teachers were not included, because it would have been impossible to sample them adequately, given their large national population. Moreover, it was felt that principals would be aware of, and could report on, the majority of challenges to classroom materials. Finally, the sponsors considered that a follow-up study might survey teachers directly on the classroom situation if the findings of the initial survey warranted such a follow-up.

Because administrators would be asked to respond about both classroom and library materials (see below, "Questionnaire Development"), fewer librarians than administrators were sampled. In addition, the sample was deliberately weighted toward superintendents (in relation to the national population), because it was felt that, of the four subgroups, they would have broadest access to the information sought and would, because of recourse to a larger support staff, be likeliest to respond to a lengthy, detailed questionnaire, particularly one coming late in the school year.

The hypothetical sample decided upon was 2,500 principals, 2,500 district superintendents, 1,250 school librarians, and 1,250 district-level library-supervisors.

The survey mailing lists, by title, position and name, were prepared by Market Data Retrieval, Westport, Connecticut 06680. Sample selection was by means of the proportional stratified sampling technique. The number of school districts of each size sampled per state was in proportion to the total number of districts of that size in the state, with the proviso that, wherever possible, each state be represented by at least one administrative unit for each of the following enrollment categories: 100-299, 300-599, 600-999, 1,000-2,999, 3,000-4,999, 5,000-9,999, 10,000-24,999, and 25,000 and up (units with enrollments less than 100 were not included in the survey). An additional constraint on sample selection was that no more than one school library and media center could be included from a given school district.

The exact numbers in the actual sample were as follows: 2,482 principals, 2,498 superintendents, 1,249 building-level librarians, and 1,342 district-level library-supervisors.

Questionnaire Development

Preparation of the survey instruments was assigned to an independent research consultant. After thoroughly reviewing the ERS and NCTE survey reports and other current literature relating to the issues to be covered by the survey, the consultant prepared a tentative outline of the key lines of questioning. This outline was then refined by the sponsors and advisory groups, who continued to oversee all subsequent stages of questionnaire development, under the guidance of the Research and Evaluation Department of the McGraw-Hill Book Company. Because the sponsors did not wish to postpone the survey to the 1980-81 school year, data collection had to be completed by the end of May 1980. (School personnel, it was felt, would be unlikely to respond to such a lengthy questionnaire during the hectic final weeks of school in June.) This schedule did not permit pretesting of the survey instruments. However, the final draft of the instruments was reviewed by a representative group of school administrators, librarians, and educators recommended for their expertise by the sponsoring and advisory organizations, and was revised as needed.

In order to gather detailed, appropriately differentiated data on classroom and library materials, separate instruments were prepared for administrators and for librarians.

Administrators' questionnaires pertained to both classroom and library materials. Librarians' questionnaries pertained almost exclusively to library materials. To maximize comparability of data from the two survey groups, the wording of questions on the two instruments was deliberately kept very similar. The great majority of questions were virtually identical. A few questions differed substantially, however, to apply specifically to the library or classroom situation. District- and building-level questionnaires within each group were differentiated only by color.

Much consideration was given to the choice of terminology on the questionnaires. The sponsors elected to avoid the term "censorship" because of widespread, often heated, controversy over its precise meaning. (While some individuals limit the term to official restrictions on expression, others use it more broadly, to refer to all efforts to limit freedom of speech and expression). The term "objections" was also ruled out, because it might be understood as referring to more technical aspects of materials--such as type size and reading level. The term "challenges" was selected as the best available term to refer to objections based on more qualitative, intrinsic considerations of content.

As far as possible, questions were constructed to provide for multiple-choice responses which could be tallied by computer. Because of the complexity of the issues being surveyed, this required many multiple-choice items (one question alone had 38 multiple-choice responses).

Because of concern that the length and complexity of the questionnaires would lead to a low response rate on all or part of the survey, the instruments were organized to obtain key data at the outset, with more detailed questions, sometimes partly duplicating earlier items, being left to the end. This overlapping also provided internal indicators of the validity of responses on certain key questions.

Implementation of the Local-Level Survey

To allow sufficient response time before the close of the school year, when school personnel are especially burdened with administrative chores, the local-level survey questionnaires were mailed in the last week of April, 1980. About one week prior to the questionnaire mailing, letters were sent to the sample population informing them of the purpose and importance of the study, and urging them to participate. The advance letters to the librarians were signed by Judith Krug, Director of the Office for Intellectual Freedom of the ALA; those to the superintendents, by James R. Kirkpatrick, Senior Associate Executive Director of the AASA; and those to the principals, by Townsend Hoopes, President of the AAP. The only material incentive offered in the questionnaire cover letter (see Appendix A) was a copy of the final report on the study. Follow-up post cards, signed by Townsend Hoopes, were sent to all individuals in the sample about ten days after the mailing of the questionnaires.

Return

A total of 1,891 questionnaires were returned by respondents in time to be processed for computer analysis. (Additional questionnaires trickled in after the cutoff date. Very few questionnaires were returned by the post office to the sender as undeliverable to the addressee; the mailing list was therefore judged to be accurate and up-to-date.) Table I of "Limiting What Students Shall Read" shows the categories of respondents in the survey sample compared to the national population and gives their rate of response.

Tables I and II below compare the survey returns with the survey sample across geographical regions and adoption categories, respectively. They reveal a great deal of similarity between the returns and the original sample, which was randomly selected and therefore reflects the national population distribution. The overall rate of return was just over 25 percent. According to Dr. Andrew Kulley, the head statistician for the Gallup Organization, this return rate is excellent, considering the length of the questionnaire and the lack of an incentive (the average return rate for such mail surveys is generally between 15% and 20%).

While this rate is not high enough to justify generalizing from the survey results to the national poplulation, it does provide a reliable indication of trends for the sample of 7,500 administrators and librarians originally contacted.

As expected, the rate of return was highest for district-level respondents (approximately 30 percent). It was somewhat lower for principals (23.2 percent), and lowest for building-level librarians (13.6 percent). One can only speculate on the very low rate of return for school librarians. Were they perhaps reluctant to respond to a questionnaire touching on areas in which (as indicated by responses to a number of items in the survey, particularly questions 5, 31, 43, 44, and 47) they appear to be highly vulnerable?

With regard to the possibility of selective nonresponse, it should be noted that one questionnaire was returned to the AAP completely blank except for the seal of the Island Trees School District (a focus of recent censorship controversy) stamped at the top.

Clearly, as anticipated, the length of the instrument was a deterrent to some individuals. (One irate nonrespondent sent back a blank questionnaire with the scribbled note "Give this to someone with more time to waste than I have!")

Table I
Comparison between Survey Sample and Returns
across Geographical Regions

Geographical Region	Administrators		Librarians		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Northeast						
Sample	1211	24.3%	652	25.2%	1863	24.6%
Return	292	22.2	135	23.4	427	22.6
South						
Sample	1184	23.8	655	25.3	1839	24.3
Return	265	20.2	113	19.6	378	20.0
Midwest						
Sample	1778	35.7	904	34.9	2682	35.4
Return	604	46.0	241	41.8	845	44.7
West						
Sample	807	16.2	381	14.7	1188	15.7
Return	153	11.6	88	15.3	241	12.7
Total						
Sample	4980	100.0	2592	100.0	7572	100.0
Return	1314	100.0	577	100.0	1891	100.0

Table II

Comparison between Survey Sample and Returns across Adoption Categories

Adoption Category	Administrators N	Administrators %	Librarians N	Librarians %	Total N	Total %
Adoption States						
Sample	2082	41.9%	1097	42.3%	3182	42.0%
Return	463	35.2	231	40.0	694	36.7
Open States						
Sample	2895	35.2	1495	57.7	4390	58.0
Return	851	64.8	346	60.0	1197	63.3
Total						
Sample	4980	100.0	2592	100.0	7572	100.0
Return	1314	100.0	577	100.0	1891	100.0

Analysis of Local-Level Survey Responses

All multiple-choice responses were tallied by computer. In addition to totals for each of the four groups of respondents, totals for the four main geographic regions (Northeast, South, Midwest, West) and for adoption/nonadoption states were obtained on all questions.

The states were assigned to the four geographic regions as follows: Northeast: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia; Midwest: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin; South: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas; and West: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

The adoption states are Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia.

The open states are Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. The District of Columbia was included in this category.

Cross-tabulations of the data from selected questions were also obtained, to test the interrelatedness of certain key factors, particularly the relationship between policies and procedures and the incidence and resolution of challenges. Some of the most interesting findings of the survey emerged from this analysis (see the Overview of Local-Level Survey Findings in "Limiting What Students Shall Read").

In addition to the computer tallies on multiple-choice responses, all questionnaires returned by respondents reporting on recent challenges were examined for their write-in responses and comments. Significant comments and write-ins are reproduced in Part I below, following the relevant questionnaire items. (For a list of recently challenged titles cited by respondents, the reader is referred to "Limiting What Students Shall Read", Appendix B.) Also included below are the write-in responses gleaned from a random selection of 20% of the questionnaires returned by respondents reporting no recent challenges. Closer examination of the profile of responses in individual questionnaires might yield useful insights but was beyond the scope of the present study.

As noted above, the major findings of the survey are summarized and interpreted in "Limiting What Students Shall Read." Not included in that report, for the sake of brevity, were several of the findings on the demographic characteristics of respondents' schools as compared with their experience of recent challenges. These findings are summarized in the paragraphs which follow.

Enrollment Size. Responses indicated a direct relationship between enrollment size and the number of recent challenges. With the exception of one small deviation (for which the N is very small--only 12 responses), the percentage of both administrators and librarians reporting recent challenges increases steadily with increasing enrollment. The average number of incidents and items challenged also increases. This is not very surprising. (Lee Burress also noted, in his report on the 1977 NCTE Survey, that the likelihood of censorship increased with the size of the school.)

Survey responses also indicated that the larger the enrollment, the more likely schools are to have formal written policies and procedures. (For example, whereas only 59.3 percent of the librarians in schools or districts with enrollments 0-299 indicated they have formal reconsideration procedures, 91.2 percent of those with enrollments 25,000 and up so indicated.) This, too, is as one would expect--larger administrative units generally have established more formalized procedures.

There appears to be no correlation at all between enrollment size and recent changes in the rate of challenges to materials.

Type of Community. The relationships observed with respect to policies and procedures and enrollment size hold quite consistently for both administrators and librarians. But when the responses to key questions are broken down by the type of community the school population is drawn from, considerable differences emerge between the two groups of respondents. Whereas only 13.5 percent of the administrators from large cities reported recent challenges, for example, 37.5 percent of the librarians from large cities so reported--as compared with a rate of 26.5 percent for all respondents in the survey. Likewise, fewer than a fifth (18.9 percent) of the rural administrators reported recent challenges, as compared with nearly a third (32.2) percent of the rural librarians.

Overall, the highest percentages of respondents reporting recent challenges were in schools serving suburban communities (28.3 percent) or small cities (population 50,000-500,000)--30.2 percent.

There were appreciable differences in the rates at which subsets of respondents replied that recent challenges had resulted in changes in the educational environment (question 5). If we exclude the respondents from large cities, because that sample was too small to be reliable, the other groups of respondents answering YES to question 5 ranked, by percentages of responses, as follows:

Administrators		Librarians		All Respondents	
Suburban	39.1%	Rural	37.1%	Suburban	36.2%
Smaller city	33.3%	Village/small town	36.6%	Rural	33.4%
Rural	31.3%	Town	34.9%	Smaller city	30.1%
Town	25.3%	Suburban	31.8%	Town	29.4%
Village/Small town	23.0%	Smaller city	25.0%	Village/small town	27.4%

Finally, the highest percentage (39.0 percent) of respondents reporting that the recent rate of challenges is higher than the previous two-year period was among librarians serving suburban communities.

The breakdown, by type of community, of responses with respect to the nature and resolution of challenges also yielded some interesting results. Overall, the percentages of responses indicating (question 33) that the challenger(s) had read the challenged material in its entirety were about a third higher in urban and suburban areas than in rural or small town communities.

On the other hand, on the question (#35) of whether the challenger(s) sought to limit or expand the information and viewpoints in the materials used, there were more divergent responses. Whereas administrators from large cities indicated "limit" in all cases, librarians from large cities reported "expand" in 26.7 percent of the cases (it should be noted, however, that the total N for the two groups was only 26).

Both librarians and administrators serving rural and small town communities, as well as respondents in smaller cities, indicated "expand" with at least double the frequency of respondents from suburban areas and larger towns (population 5,000 to 49,999). Respondents serving urban and suburban communities about one third more frequently reported that challenges were dealt with formally than did respondents serving rural areas and towns.

On the question (#37) of whether or not material was censored prior to a formal review, the highest percentages of YES responses were among administrators (90.0 percent) and librarians (68.4 percent) serving large cities. (Again, the total N for this group of respondents was rather small, only 29). The lowest percentage of YES replies was from suburban respondents (40.3 percent overall). On question 44, relating to the final disposition of the challenge, respondents serving suburban communities about one third more often than most other respondents reported that the challenge was overrulled and less than half as often reported that the challenged material was removed from the school. It is otherwise difficult to discern a consistent pattern of responses on this question, however.

The State-Level Survey

For a brief overview of the state-level survey, see "Limiting What Students Shall Read," pp. 18-21. The remarks which follow will serve as a supplement to that discussion.

Survey Design. Because the adoption states exert an influence far beyond their relatively small number, the sponsors elected to survey the entire population (N=22), both by mail questionnaire and, where feasible, by follow-up telephone interviews.

As noted in "Limiting What Students Shall Read," the state-level questionnaire was adapted from the instruments used on the local level. Because the state-level questionnaire pertained almost exclusively to instructional materials under consideration for adoption (rather than to both classroom and library materials already in use in the schools), and because the mail survey would be supplemented with telephone interviews, this mail questionnaire was much briefer than those used on the local level.

Draft copies of the state-level instrument were reviewed by key representatives of the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Association of State Boards of Education, as well as representatives of the AAP School Division. The final draft of the questionnaire was revised as needed on the basis of the reviewers' suggestions.

Since state education department personnel are generally available during the summer months, this survey could be completed after the cut-off date on the local-level survey. The questionnaires were mailed in late May 1980, and the bulk of the interviews were conducted during August, with a few follow-up calls carrying over into October of that year. All phone interviews were conducted by the project research consultant. In most cases, the chief textbook official, to whom the mail questionnaire was addressed, was available for the telephone follow-up. In six of the responding states, some other department representative participated in the telephone interview.

PART I

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO SURVEY OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND LIBRARIANS

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, the survey questions were identical for administrators and librarians, and the response rates given are for all respondents. Appropriate headings indicate where questions and/or response rates differed for the two groups. Occasionally, differences between response rates of the various groups are noted in the comments.

Because of the length and complexity of the questionnaire, most respondents did not answer all items. The N therefore varies considerably from question to question. Where respondents had the option of checking more than one answer, the N given is for the number of responses, not respondents, and is marked with an asterisk.

A. Background Information

1. How long have you been in your present administrative post?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,891)
Less than 2 years	13.7%
2-5 years	25.9%
5-15 years	47.4%
More than 15 years	13.0%

The responses in both groups approximate a normal curve of distribution, with a peak at 5-15 years. Nearly half (47.4 percent) of all respondents were in this category.

The administrators' curve, however, was skewed more toward the shorter periods than was the librarians' (42.4 percent of the administrators responded that they were at their present post 5 years or less, as opposed to 33.3 percent of the librarians).

Administrators

2. To your knowledge, have there been any challenges to instructional or library materials in your school(s) DURING THE PERIOD SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1978?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,317)
Yes	19.2%
No	80.8%

Librarians

2. To your knowledge, have there been any challenges to library materials in your school(s) DURING THE PERIOD SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1978?

Responses	Percentages (N=580)
Yes	29.5%
No	70.5%

Of the total of 1,897 respondents to this item, 424 (22.4 percent) answered YES.[3] The positive response rate for the various subgroups ranked (from lowest to highest percentages) as follows: principals (19.0), superintendents (19.4), librarians (21.5), and library-supervisors (32.8).

Regional Breakdown. Percentages of respondents reporting recent challenges were fairly uniform from region to region (Northeast, 21.4; South, 20.3; Midwest, 23.4; West, 24.8) and by adoption category (adoption states, 22.7; open states, 22.1). Only one group of respondents deviated more than two percentage points from the overall national average--that is, librarians from the West, 34.8 percent of whom reported recent challenges, as compared to the 29.5 percent rate for all librarians responding.

Administrators

In the period since September 1, 1978, have there been any challenges to the way instructional or library materials are selected in your school(s)?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,297)
Yes	6.9%
No	93.1%

Librarians

In the period since September 1, 1978, have there been any challenges to the way library materials are selected in your school(s)?

Responses	Percentages (N=566)
Yes	4.6%
No	95.4%

Only 115 respondents (6.2 percent) in all reported challenges to the selection process since September 1, 1978.

IF YOU ANSWERED NO TO BOTH PARTS OF QUESTION 2, please skip to question 6.

3. In the period since September 1, 1978, how many incidents of challenges have there been?

(N=408)

Some respondents, apparently confused by the wording, gave higher numbers here than in question 4. While the data are therefore not reliable in absolute terms, they were useful for ranking purposes.

The ranking of respondent groups, by mean number of incidents each group reported (from highest to lowest), was as follows:

(1) superintendents
(2) library supervisors
(3) principals
(4) building librarians

It is not surprising that the administrators ranked higher in mean number of incidents than the librarians, since they were reporting on challenges to classroom as well as library materials.

Administrators

4. How many separate materials or items have been challenged in the period since September 1, 1978? (If you do not know the exact number, please give an approximate figure.)

(N=231)

Librarians

4. How many separate library items have been challenged in the period since September 1, 1978? (If you do not know the exact number, please give an approximate figure.)

(N=163)

As with question 3, the data from question 4 have been used only for ranking purposes. Overall, the librarians reported a higher mean number of items challenged than did the administrators. The highest figures were at the district level in both groups--not surprisingly, since those respondents generally oversee larger populations.

How does this rate compare with the rate of challenges in the two-year period preceding September 1, 1978?

Responses	Percentages (N=494)
Lower	9.1%
About the same	50.6%
Higher	26.5%
Not certain	13.8%

Librarians' and administrators' responses were very similar. Frequency of responses, overall, are indicated above. While about half (50.6 percent) of the respondents who answered this question indicated that the recent rate of challenges was about the same as the rate in the preceding two-year period, over a fourth (26.5 percent) indicated that it was higher. (Of the 175 respondents reporting a change in the rate of challenges, 75.0 percent indicated that it was higher.)

Regional Breakdown. There were a number of regional differences in the response rates on this question. The largest percentage of respondents answering "higher" occurred among administrators from the Midwest, 30.4 percent of whom so responded, as contrasted with the smallest figure (16.2 percent) among administrators from the West. On the other hand, 31.4 percent of the librarians from the West responded "lower."

Exactly 60.0 percent of the administrators from the Northeast responded "about the same," while only 43.0 percent of the librarians and administrators from the Midwest so responded.

Differences also emerged when the responses were broken down by adoption category. Respondents from the open states answered "higher" more often than did those from the adoption states. The figures for administrators and librarians responding "higher" were 31.4 and 28.4 percent, respectively, for the open states as compared with 18.5 and 22.9 percent for the adoption states.

Administrators

5. Has any of the challenges since September 1, 1978, resulted in changes in the materials used or in the educational process or environment?

Responses	Percentages (N=317)
Yes	26.8%
No	68.5%
Case still pending	4.7%

Librarians

5. Has any of the challenges since September 1, 1978, resulted in changes in the holdings, organization, or operation of your library or media center(s)?

Responses	Percentages (N=193)
Yes	33.7%
No	64.8%
Case still pending	1.6%

Overall, 29.4 percent of the 510 respondents on this question answered YES. The highest positive response was from building-level librarians (37.8 percent). That the school library is most vulnerable to challenges is also attested by the administrators' responses to the second part of this question, where they indicated that, of all the educational aspects listed, library materials were most often affected by recent challenges.

Regional Breakdown. Among librarians, regional differences on this question were marked. Whereas only 20 percent of the librarians in the West reported that recent challenges had resulted in changes, 48.6 percent of the librarians in the South so reported.

Among administrators, regional differences were less striking. The highest rate of positive response was 31.3 percent, from the West. The lowest rate was 22.4 percent, for administrators from the Northeast.

Administrators

IF YES, please indicate which of the following has been affected (Check all that apply):

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=235*)
Library materials	32.7
Supplementary classroom materials	17.9
Textbooks used in the classroom	11.5
Materials selection procedure	11.1
Materials selection policy	8.1
Curriculum content	6.8
Teaching methodology	4.7
Personnel (firing, resignation, or reassignment)	3.0
Extracurricular activities	0.4
Other(s)	3.8

Librarians

IF YES, please indicate which of the following has been affected (Check all that apply):

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=112*)
Holdings	35.7
Access to certain items	29.5
Arrangement of holdings	17.8
Selection policy	10.7
Cataloging or identification of holdings	4.5
Personnel (firing, resignation, or reassignment)	0.9
Other(s)	0.9

Since respondents had the option of checking more than one answer, the percentages given above are based on the total number of responses, not on the number of respondents.

Administrators reported that library materials were affected almost twice as often as supplementary classroom materials, and almost three times as often as textbooks used in the classroom.

Five principals, two superintendents, and a library-supervisor here reported personnel changes as a result of challenges in the pe.iod since September 1, 1978. (Compare question 47 below.)

Other aspects respondents listed as affected by recent challenges included the following:

"Family life materials."
"Sex education was required of all. Parents can now sign to have a student skip a portion or all of the class."
"Future purchases."
"Reading level."

---

6. By which procedure(s) are classroom instructional materials selected in the school(s) you serve?

Responses	Basal Textbooks (N=1,818)	Supplementary Classroom Materials (N=1,650)
Local district autonomy	50.4%	72.7%
From state-approved list	28.3%	5.6%
From county-approved list	4.0%	2.4%
From city-approved list	1.5%	1.5%
Procedures differ for elementary and secondary	2.6%	4.9%
Other	2.4%	4.2%
[More than one response checked]	10.8%	8.7%

Among other responses were the following:

"Teacher selection."
"School Committee."
"Title IV-B."

Administrators

7. Does the school (district) you administer have a formal written policy governing the selection of instructional materials?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,261)
Yes	52.8%
No	47.2%

Librarians

IF CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS ARE SELECTED FROM APPROVED OR ADOPTION LISTS, please interpret all questions on materials selection as referring to library materials not on approved or adoption lists.

7. Does the school (district) you serve have a formal written policy governing the selection of library materials?

Responses	Percentages (N=564)
Yes	74.3%
No	25.7%

Taking the two groups together, 59.4 percent of all respondents on this question (N=1,825) indicated they had a formal selection policy.

Regional Breakdown. Some marked regional differences emerged on this question. The highest positive response rates were from the West; the lowest, from the South. The difference was most dramatic among administrators. Just under 70.0 percent of those in the West responded YES, as compared with 45.4 percent of those in the South. For librarians, the positive response rate in the West was 81.8 percent; in the South, 70.5 percent.

Administrators

8. Does the school (district) you administer have formal written procedures for the reconsideration of instructional materials that have been challenged?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,295)
Yes	49.1%
No	50.9%

Librarians

8. Does the school (district) you serve have formal written procedures for the reconsideration of library materials that have been challenged?

Responses	Percentages (N=570)
Yes	76.8%
No	23.2%

Responses to this question closely mirror those to the preceding question, suggesting that schools with a formal selection policy have formal reconsideration procedures as well. Overall, 57.6 percent of the 1,865 respondents indicated they had formal reconsideration procedures.

Regional Breakdown. Regional differences on this question paralleled those on question 7. Just over 60.0 percent of the administrators in the West responded YES, as compared with 40.9 percent of those in the South. The positive response for administrators from the Northeast (45.8 percent) was also several points lower than the national average.

Positive response rates for the open versus adoption states were 51.4 and 44.9 percent, respectively.

IF YES, which statement best describes your reconsideration procedures?

Administrators

Responses	Percentages (N=620)
Part of overall selection policy statement	53.9%
Separate from selection policy statement	46.1%

Librarians

Responses	Percentages (N=431)
Part of library selection policy statement	70.8%
Separate from selection policy statement	29.2%

Again, there are appreciable differences between administrators' and librarians' responses, with librarians reporting far more often (70.8 percent) than administrators (53.9 percent) that their reconsideration procedures are part of their selection policy statement.

Administrators

9. What grades are under your administration?

Librarians

9. What grades do you serve?

Responses	Percentages		
	Administrators (N=1,298)	Librarians (N=561)	All Respondents) (N=1,859)
K-6	18.6%	12.1%	16.2%
K-8	8.6%	7.1%	8.2%
K-12	47.8%	37.8%	44.8%
7-9	2.5%	3.9%	3.8%
7-12	3.2%	10.2%	5.3%
9-12	8.1%	16.6%	10.6%
Other	11.8%	12.3%	11.9%

The largest group of respondents (47.8 percent of the administrators, 37.8 percent of the librarians, and 44.8 percent overall) served grades K-12.

Grades K-8 accounted for 26.6 percent of the administrators, 19.2 percent of the librarians, and 24.4 percent overall.

Intermediate and upper grades 7-12 together accounted for 13.8 percent of the administrators, 30.7 percent of the librarians, and 18.9 percent of all the respondents.

Thus, the librarians' group was skewed more to the upper grades than was the administrators' group.

Approximately 12 percent of the respondents in both groups indicated that they served grade spans other than those listed on the questionnaire.

Administrators

10. How many students are under your administration?

Responses
0-299
300-599
600-999
1,000-2,999
3,000-4,999
5,000-9,999
10,000-24,999
25,000 and up

Librarians

10. How many students are enrolled in the schools(s) you serve?

Percentages (N=1,884)
10.9%
27.0%
18.7%
23.1%
7.0%
6.6%
3.5%
3.2%

[Note: The original sample omitted schools with enrollments under 100.]

The percentages listed above are for all respondents. Schools and districts with enrollments less than 3,000 accounted for 79.7 percent of all respondents, with the largest single group in the 300-599 bracket.

There were some differences in enrollment distribution between the responding subgroups, however. Nearly half (42.4 percent) of the administrators were in the 0-599 categories, as opposed to just over a fourth (26.8 percent) of the librarians; while 20.4 percent of the librarians were in the 5,000-25,000 and up categories, as opposed to only 10.3 percent of the administrators.

Also, building-level respondents were most numerous in the 300-599 category (46.1 percent), while the largest single group of district-level respondents (30.0 percent) was in the 1,000-2,999 category.

---

11. What sort of community is your school population drawn from? (Check all that apply.)

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=2,368*)
Rural	27.6%
Village or small town (up to 5,000 pop.)	22.9%
Town (pop. 5,000-49,999)	22.6%
Suburban	14.8%
Smaller city (pop. 50,000-500,000)	8.6%
Large city (pop. over 500,000)	3.5%

---

*Respondents had the option of checking more than one response. (About one fourth of the respondents did so.) Percentages listed above are based on the total number of responses, not the number of respondents.

Schools serving rural areas, villages, and/or small townships (pop. under 50,000) were most heavily represented, with a combined frequency of 73.1 percent, as opposed to a total frequency of 12.1 percent for schools serving urban communities (pop. over 50,000), and 14.8 percent for those serving suburban communities. The rural/small town figure was undoubtedly magnified by overlapping multiple responses, more likely to occur in these categories than in the urban-suburban categories.

It is perhaps also worth noting differences between building- and district-level responses to this question. Whereas 20.8 percent of the building-level responses indicated urban communities (pop. 50,000 and over), only 7.4 percent of the district-level responses did so. Rural/small town communities, however, were more heavily represented by district-level respondents (55.6 percent of their total responses were in these categories) than by building-level respondents (only 41.3 percent of their total responses fell into these groups).

---

12. Please indicate your rough estimate of the economic make-up of your school population (please be sure total equals 100%):

Responses	Mean Percentages	
	Administrators (N=1,270)	Librarians (N=501)
Poverty level	11.0%	9.0%
Low	19.4%	19.2%
Lower-middle	37.7%	39.2%
Upper-middle	26.0%	28.1%
High	6.9%	7.9%
Total	101.0%	103.4%

Totals in excess of 100% may be due partly to rounding error, partly to respondents' error in giving percentages totaling more than 100%.

Responses in both groups fall into a normal distribution and indicate that the survey sample is representative of the total population with respect to economic makeup.

---

13. What is the zip code of your office?

Zip codes were used to identify the respondents' state and to group them by geographic region and adoption category. Table II (see above, p. vii) shows the sample breakdown compared to the national population. As the table indicates, the sample quite closely reflects the national distribution, except for the following: a somewhat higher percentage of both administrators and librarians from the Midwest; a somewhat lower percentage of administrators from the South and the West; and a slightly higher percentage of administrators from the "open," as opposed to the "adoption," states.

IF YOU HAVE NO FORMAL WRITTEN POLICIES COVERNING MATERIALS SELECTION OR RECONSIDERATION, please skip to question 17-A (18-L).

B. Policies and Procedures

14. At what level was your materials selection policy developed and approved? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages	
	Developed (N=1,503*)	Approved (N=1,273*)
At the state level	6.9%	6.3%
At the county level	9.3%	9.7%
At the city level	3.8%	3.6%
At the district level	55.3%	64.6%
At the building Level	13.1%	8.9%
At the departmental level	10.1%	6.0%
Other(s)	1.5%	0.9%

Some respondents checked more than one answer in each column. Percentages are therefore calculated on the total number of responses (not respondents).

---

15. What controversial issues are referred to in your selection policy? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages (N=2,635*)
None	22.5%
Racism	13.4%
Religion	13.3%
Sexism	12.5%
Minority group representation	12.1%
Sex and sexuality	11.9%
Scientific theories	5.2%
Ageism	3.3%
Other(s)	5.8%

Administrators and librarians responded similarly. Percentages (based on total number of responses) for both groups combined are given above.

Other issues noted by respondents included the following:

"Political fringes."
"Language, slang, and offensive words and pictures."
"Materials representing many points of view are encouraged."
"Provide materials on opposing sides of controversial issues."
"Overthrow of U.S. gov't."
"Obscene nature."
"Bias-free."
"Ideologies and profanity."
"Political theories and ideologies."

Librarians

16. Please check if your selection policy statement reaffirms the following (or any other pertinent professional statement):

Responses	Percentages (N=352)
The American Library Association's "Library Bill of Rights" (only)	62.2%
The ALA-AAP "Freedom to Read" Statement (only)	3.1%
Other(s)	5.4%
[More than one response checked]	29.3%

Out of the 419 librarians who indicated (question 7, above) that they have a formal selection policy, 352 (84 percent) responded that their policy statement reaffirms the ALA "Library Bill of Rights," the ALA-AAP "Freedom-to-Read Statement," and/or some other pertinent professional statement.

Other statements or professional groups cited by librarians with reference to their selection policy included the following:

Massachusetts Library Association
U.S. Bill of Rights
Keller Schools Philosophy
School Library Bill of Rights [cited by several respondents]
NCTE: "Right-to-Read" resolution [cited by several respondents]
Iowa Association of School Librarians
School Media Center Bill of Rights

Administrators

16. Does your school (district) inform parents and other members of the community about the policies and procedures for selecting and reconsidering instructional materials?

Responses	Percentages (N=774)
Yes	61.5%
No	37.5%

IF YES, how?

Librarians

17. Do you inform parents and other members of the community about your selection policy and reconsideration procedures?

Responses	Percentages (N=422)
Yes	42.7%
No	57.3%

IF YES, how?

Overall, 54.8 percent of the 1,196 respondents indicated they do inform the community about selection policies and procedures, but note the sizable difference between administrators' and librarians' responses (61.5 and 42.7 percent, respectively).

A positive response to this question was taken as one indicator of good public relations programs.

The majority of respondents who answered IF YES, how? entered comments such as "when there's an inquiry" or "only when challenged," which indicate a relatively weak outreach effort. The following comments indicate a stronger community relations program:

"Parent information packets."
"District notice to parents regarding impending text/materials selections."
"Televised school board meetings and newspaper."
"Written information from system level to all parents through newsletter--newspapers."
"Members of the public served on the committee which developed the policy."
"Have Library Media/Community Advisory Council and in-service meetings."
"Board meetings, publicity statements, school handbooks."
"All new students are given information about the library policy, including book selection policy.
"Parent advisory group; parent information workshop."
"Through district policy handbook distributed to parents and staff."
"Community newsletter."
"Sending home copy of procedures."

IF AVAILABLE, PLEASE ENCLOSE A COPY OF YOUR MATERIALS SELECTION POLICY AND RECONSIDERATION PROCEDURES.

Administrators

C. Evaluation and Selection of Textbooks and Instructional Materials

17. Does the school (district) you administer have its own instructional materials selection committee?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,276)
Yes	55.7%
No	44.3%

IF YES, please skip to question 18.

The positive response to this question was slightly higher among principals (58.1 percent) than among superintendents (53.9 percent).

Administrators

IF NO, which of the following individuals is involved at each stage of selecting instructional materials for use in your schools(s)?

Evaluate and Recommend Materials (N=2,791*)		Final Choice and Approval (N=1,486*)	
Responses	Percentages	Responses	Percentages
Teachers	21.5%	Principals	20.6%
Principals	16.8%	Superintendents	20.3%
Librarians	15.6%	School Board	16.3%
Department heads	10.2%	Teachers	11.8%
Curriculum Specialists	7.0%	Librarians	9.4%
Superintendent	6.7%	Department heads	6.4%
Assistant principals	5.3%	Assistant superintendents	5.8%
Guidance specialists	5.1%	Curriculum specialists	3.8%
Assistant superintendents	4.2%	Assistant principals	2.6%
Parents	2.8%	Guidance specialists	1.5%
Students	2.6%	Parents	0.7%
School board	1.4%	Students	0.5%
Other	0.8%	Other	0.3%

The responses given above are for all administrators and are ranked by percentages.

Principals' and superintendents' groups responded very similarly, on all but two items: (1) The superintendents' group more often cited superintendents as involved in evaluation (8.2 percent) and approval (22.5 percent) than did principals (4.5 and 16.9 percent, respectively). (2) Guidance specialists were cited as involved in evaluation somewhat more often by superintendents (6.2 percent) than by principals (3.5 percent).

Respondents' comments:

"Depends on what material we are talking about."
"Health Education materials will be passed by Health Advisory Committee."

Librarians

C. Evaluation and Selection of Library Materials

18. Who suggests materials for your library or media center(s)? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages (N=3,405*)
Teachers	16.8%
Librarians	16.4%
Students	15.0%
Principals	11.0%
Guidance specialists	9.9%
Curriculum specialists	8.7%
Parents	6.3%
Assistant principals	6.2%
Superintendents	3.9%
Assistant superintendents	2.8%
School board members	2.1%
Other(s)	1.0%

---

*Librarians and library-supervisors responded similarly on this item (overall percentages are given above).

Under Other(s), one respondent indicated: "Sales representatives."

Administrators

18. How many of the following individuals are (were) represented on your current (or most recent) materials selection committee? (Please also give total number of committee members.)

Responses (ranked from most to least numerous)	Average Number of Members per Committee
Teacher(s)	4.6
School board member(s)	3.0 (P=3.6; S=2.7)
Parent(s)	3.0
Department head(s)	2.7
Teachers' organization representative(s)	2.7
Student(s)	2.2

18. (continued)

Responses (ranked from most to least numerous)	Average Number of Members per Committee
Principal(s)	1.9
Civic leader(s)	1.9
Assistant principal(s)	1.8
Curriculum specialist(s)	1.6
Librarian(s) or media specialist(s)	1.6
Instructional specialist(s)	1.4
Director of media center	1.2
Director of curriculum	1.1
Superintendent	1.0
Assistant superintendent	1.0
Others	2.0 (P=1.2, S=2.4)

Responses of principals (P) and superintendents (S) were closely comparable (averages within 0.1 or 0.2), except with respect to "school board members" and "others." The disparate averages are given above.

A question should be posed about the number of principals reported by principals to be selection committee members (average 1.8). As worded, question 18 should have been interpreted by principals as referring to building-level committees. If that were the case, would more than one principal be involved?

A broad range of composition was indicated, particularly with regard to parent participation. Some respondents reported that in their school(s) parents per se (lay members) were not included on the selection committees at all, while in other schools respondents indicated that selection committees had parent majorities.

Many respondents indicated that their school(s) had separate selection committees for different subject areas. A number of respondents noted that materials selection was left entirely to individual teachers or to the various departments.

Other comments:

"Committees vary in size and membership. They always include teachers and subject specialist. Parents and students are always invited to serve."

"Every member of each department is consulted on textbook requests."

Administrators

19. What is the function of your local materials selection committee?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,046)
To review and recommend materials	32.1%
To review and select materials, subject to approval	48.3%
To review, select, and adopt materials, without further approval	10.2%
Other	2.0%
[More than one response checked]	7.4%

Responses of principals' and superintendents' groups were closely comparable on all items (largest spread was under 3.0 percentage points). Percentages given above are for both groups combined. The largest number--nearly half (48.3 percent) of all respondents--indicated that their selection committee's function is "to review and select materials, subject to approval," while 32.1 percent reported it as only "to review and recommend."

A number of respondents noted that the function of their selection committee is also to review challenged materials.

Administrators

20. If your local selection committee does not have the authority to make the final determination regarding materials, who gives final approval? (Check all that apply.)

Librarians

19. If you do not make the final determination regarding the purchase of library or media center materials, who gives final approval?

Responses	Percentages		
	Administrators (N=1,289*)	Building-Librarians (N=46*)	Library-Supervisors (N=153*)
Local school board	50.4%	6.5%	16.3%
District superintendent	25.7%	23.9%	34.0%
School principal(s)	15.4%	39.1%	33.3%
Teacher(s)	5.3%	2.2%	0.7%
Other(s)	3.2%	28.3%	15.7%

Some respondents checked more than one item. Percentages are therefore based on the total number of responses. Since there were sizable differences in the way administrators, librarians, and library-supervisors responded, the results for the three groups are given separately above.

Librarians

20. Have you ever met with representatives of publishing houses or nonprint media companies to discuss their materials?

Responses	Percentages (N=575)
Yes	83.1%
No	16.9%

The high positive response rate (83.1 percent) here may be due to the broad wording of the question, which can be taken to include contact at professional conferences, etc., in addition to actual visits by publishers' representatives to the school(s).

One respondent commented: "If they would ever visit the school."

Administrators

21. Do publishers' representatives have an opportunity to explain their materials to the committee or individuals responsible for evaluation and selection?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,[illegible])
Yes	92.4%
No	7.6%

IF YES, when? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages (N=1,317*)
At reviewing stage	81.0%
After selection	15.1%
After challenges	3.9%

Administrators

22. In the school (district) you administer are there provisions for special interest groups to make their views known to the persons responsible for evaluating or selecting materials?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,252)
Yes	57.8%
No	42.2%

Librarians

21. Have you ever met with representatives of special interest groups to discuss controversial aspects of the library's holdings?

Responses	Percentages (N=574)
Yes	14.5%
No	85.5%

IF YES, when?

Responses	Percentages		
	Building-Librarians (N=14)	Library-Supervisors (N=69)	Total (N=83)
Routinely, independent of any challenges	50.0%	60.9%	59.0%
After materials were challenged	50.0%	39.1%	41.0%

As the above figures show, there was a marked difference between the librarians' and administrators' responses on this item. Differences were also evident within the librarians' group: only 7.6 percent of the building-level librarians, as compared with 17.3 percent of the library-supervisors, responded YES to this question.

Of the 83 librarians who responded YES to the first part of this question, 41.0 percent indicated that they met with special-interest groups only after materials were challenged. Again, the breakdown of

responses by subgroups suggested a greater public relations effort on the district level than on the building level. A higher percentage of library-supervisors (60.9 percent) than building-level librarians (50.0 percent) indicated that they had such meetings "routinely, independent of any challenges."

Librarians

22. On which of the following do you rely most heavily in evaluating and selecting library materials? (Circle number from 1 for most important to 6 for least important.)

Responses (ranked from most to least important)	N*	Mean Figures
Professional reviews	564	1.89
Your own examination of the material	548	1.92
Teachers	560	2.19
Educational research and/or classroom experience	527	2.80
Other(s)	65	3.28
Publishers' representatives and promotional materials	528	4.43

Responses varied considerably, with the entire ranking scale of 1 to 6 being covered for each of the six answers listed on the questionnaire. (For example, though most respondents indicated that "publishers' representatives and materials" were less important to them than other evaluation factors, a total of 36 respondents checked 1 or 2 on the scale for this item.)

Librarians

23. If you were considering the purchase of potentially controversial library material you judged to have real educational or literary value, which of the following would you be most likely to do?

Responses	Percentages (N=544)
Decide not to purchase in spite of educational value	6.4%
Decide to purchase in spite of controversial aspects	17.3%
Consult with teachers and administrative staff and be guided by their judgment	73.7%
Other	2.6%

Building-level librarians and library-supervisors responded similarly (within 3 percentage points) on the above items.

Next to "Decide not to purchase" one respondent noted: "because of budget limitations."

Other responses included the following:

"Review with library advisory committee."

"Approach key board members."

"I maintain an excellent relationship with our local state university staff and feel I can rely on them if needed."

A few district librarians noted that they would purchase the material but restrict its circulation.

Administrators

23. When controversial materials are selected, are any provisions made to explain them to parents and other members of the community?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,155)
Yes	59.8%
No	40.2%

IF YES, when?

Responses	Percentages (N=680)
Before materials are challenged (only)	54.1%
After materials are challenged (only)	35.0%
[Both responses checked]	10.9%

IF YES, what sorts of provisions are made? (Check all that apply.)

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=1,477*)
Discussion meetings with parents	39.0%
Written rationales	17.0%
Local newspaper items	13.9%
School newspaper items	11.2%
P.T.A. newsletter	9.3%
Mini-lessons for parents	5.3%
Other	4.2%

On the question of what sorts of provisions are made, the responses of principals' and superintendents' groups were closely comparable (within 3 percentage points) on all items. The percentages given above are for both groups combined. (Some respondents checked more than one item; percentages are therefore based on the total number of responses, rather than on the number of respondents.)

One respondent indicated that controversial materials were explained to students, not parents. Other respondents noted the following provisions:

"Meeting with concerned groups."
"Letters to parents."
"Parent permission slips."
"Sex survey in Health."
"Poster for TV program 'Holocaust.'"
"Parent release to read given item that is 'restricted.'"

Librarians

24. What provisions are made in the school(s) you serve to inform the local community (students, teachers, parents, local residents, etc.) about the school library's educational program?

Responses	Percentages		
	Building-Librarians	Library-Supervisors	All Librarians
	(N=170)	(N=405)	(N=575)
No special provisions	28.8%	21.7%	23.8%
School newspaper items	7.6%	3.7%	4.9%
Local newspaper items	4.1%	3.5%	3.7%
Hold library open house periodically	6.5%	3.7%	4.5%
Hold informal discussions with parents	2.4%	0.7%	1.2%
Discussions at P.T.A. meetings	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%
Other	4.1%	2.0%	2.6%
[More than one response checked]	45.9%	64.4%	59.0%

As the response rates above show, the public relations activities listed here appear, overall, to be more frequent on the district level. While 28.8 percent of the building-level librarians reported "no special provisions" for informing the local community, only 21.7 percent of the library-supervisors so responded. On the other hand, 64.4 percent of the library-supervisors reported more than one kind of provision, while only 45.9 percent of the building -level librarians so indicated.

Of the respondents who checked "Other," several specified that report card stuffers were used. Several others noted that slide presentations were made.

IF THERE HAVE BEEN NO CHALLENGES TO INSTRUCTIONAL OR LIBRARY MATERIALS IN YOUR SCHOOL (DISTRICT) SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1978, please skip to question 52.

Administrators	Librarians
D. Challenges to Materials Selected for School Libraries and Classrooms	D. Challenges to School Library Materials
24. In the period since September 1, 1978, what kinds (categories) of instructional or library items have been challenged in your school(s)? (Check all that apply)	25. In the period since September 1, 1978, what kinds (categories) of library materials have been challenged in your school(s)? (Check all that apply.)

Responses (ranked by percentages within each group of respondents)

Administrators (N=482*)		Librarians (N=355*)		All Respondents (N=837*)	
Fiction, contemporary	36.0	Fiction, contemporary	38.1	Fiction, contemporary	36.8
Textbooks	14.3	Nonfiction trade books	13.2	Textbooks	11.5
Fiction, classics	8.7	Children's picture books	10.1	Nonfiction trade books	8.6
Magazines	5.8	Textbooks	7.6	Children's picture books	7.5
16 mm. educational films	5.8	Magazines	6.8	Fiction, classics	7.2
Children's picture books	5.6	Fiction, classics	5.1	Magazines	6.2
Nonfiction trade books	5.2	16 mm. educational films	5.1	16 mm. educational films	5.5
Entire course or curriculum	4.1	Entire course or curriculum	2.5	Entire course or curriculum	2.5
Reference books other than dictionaries	2.9	Poetry	2.5	Reference books other than dictionaries	2.4
Dramatic or theatrical material	2.5	Reference books other than dictionaries	1.7	Dramatic or theatrical material	2.1
Brochures, pamphlets, etc.	2.3	Dramatic or theatrical material	1.7	Poetry	1.8
Poetry	1.2	Dictionaries	0.8	Brochures, pamphlets, etc.	1.6
Newspapers	0.6	Brochures pamphlets, etc.	0.6	Dictionaries	0.6
Dictionaries	0.4			Newspapers	0.3

As might be expected, the frequency with which different kinds of materials were reported as challenged varied considerably from the administrators' to the librarians' group. (Administrators were asked to report on library as well as classroom materials, whereas librarians were asked to report only on library materials.) Both groups ranked contemporary fiction highest.

Several respondents cited filmstrips. Other nonprint materials challenged included a slide set and a cassette.

Also cited as challenged were the following materials:
"Music selection."
"Gift books from Planned Parenthood & Voters for Life."
"Science filmstrips."
"Filmstrips - Human Sexuality."
"Wall mural." [on evolution]
"Folklore materials."
"Science Fiction."
"Full Language Arts Program."
"Square dancing in physical education."
"Lack of sex education."
"Sex survey in Health."
"Poster for TV program 'Holocaust.'"

---

26. What were alleged to be the objectionable aspects of the challenged materials? (Check all that apply).

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=1,700*)
"Dirty words"	14.5%
Obscenity	11.6%
Explicit representation of sex	8.3%
Profanity	6.9%
Sexism	4.7%
Religious bias	4.0%
Violence	4.0%
Nudity	3.6%
The occult	3.6%
"Undermining of traditional family"	2.9%
Realism	2.8%
Homosexuality	2.6%
Explicit discussion of drugs and drug abuse	2.5%
Racism	2.0%
Darwinism, evolution	2.0%
Moral relativism or situation ethics	2.0%

26. (continued)

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=1,700*)
Values clarification	2.0%
Minority representation	1.9%
Abortion	1.8%
"Secular humanism"	1.7%
Antitraditional/antiestablishment views	1.5%
Substandard English usage or dialect	1.3%
Negative or pessimistic views	1.3%
Atheistic or agnostic views	1.2%
Emphasis on psychology or feelings	1.2%
Scientific theories	1.0%
Invasion of personal privacy	0.8%
Death and dying	0.8%
Pagan studies	0.7%
Criticism of U.S. history	0.7%
Atrocities	0.6%
"Questionable" or "subversive" authors	0.6%
Ethnic studies	0.5%
Ageism	0.4%
Internationalism	0.2%
Other(s)	2.6%

The broad spread of aspects cited by respondents recalls Lee Burress's contention (in his report on the 1977 NCTE survey, cited in n.2) that the censorship attempts he reported were essentially capricious. It is interesting to note that the aspects most often reported as challenged on the local level were related to sex and obscenity, issues which have long incited would-be censors. (But compare the responses to question 16 on the state-level survey.)

It should be noted that some of the respondents who checked "sexism" may have confused the term with issues of sexuality rather than gender--to judge from the titles and the other objectionable aspects they cited. Other aspects specified by respondents included the following:

"Inappropriate for age level."
"Bad image of a baby-sitter."
"Stages of fetal growth in mother."
"Criticism of Santa Claus and Christmas."
"Not relevant to times."
"[Textbook] not as good as one preferred."
"Represent graven image."
"Sinful."
"Dangerous chemical experiment."
"This book teaches children that you don't get punished if you do something bad."
"Changing a diaper on infant."

As with the responses to question 24 (25-L), there were some differences between the two groups' responses to these questions, however. The ranking (by percentage of responses) of the ten most cited aspects was as follows:

As Reported by Administrators (N=976*)	%	As Reported by Librarians (N=724*)	%	As Reported by All Respondents (N=1,700*)	%
"Dirty words"	15.2%	"Dirty words"	14.4%	"Dirty words"	14.5%
Obscenity	12.8%	Explicit sex	11.0%	Obscenity	11.6%
Explicit sex	6.3%	Obscenity	9.9%	Explicit sex	8.3%
Sexism	6.1%	Profanity	8.0%	Profanity	6.9%
Profanity	6.0%	Violence	4.4%	Sexism	4.7%
Religious bias	4.2%	Nudity	4.1%	Religious bias	4.0%
Violence	3.7%	The occult	4.0%	Violence	4.0%
The occult	3.4%	Realism	3.9%	Nudity	3.6%
Nudity	3.2%	Religious bias	3.7%	The occult	3.6%
"Undermining of traditional family"	3.1%	Sexism	2.8%	"Undermining of traditional family"	2.9%

IF MORE THAN THREE SPECIFIC TITLES (OR ITEMS) HAVE BEEN CHALLENGED IN THE PERIOD SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1978, please respond, in questions 26-52 [L-27-53],on the three challenges which have had the greatest impact on your school(s) and might have relevance for other schools as well. (You will probably find it easiest to answer the questions, in order, for one case at a time, rather than for all cases at once.)

IF YOU WISH TO RESPOND ON MORE THAN THREE CHALLENGES, you may photocopy the balance of this questionnaire for additional responses.

26. Please identify the challenged items, and indicate what <u>kind</u> (category) of material each is (giving the appropriate <u>letter</u> from the list in question 24 [25-L].

The questionnaire provided space for full case-by-case responses on three separate challenges. Some respondents indicated, by marginal remarks on the questionnaire, that they misinterpreted this instruction, however. Thinking that it meant they were not to answer questions 26-52 unless they had had <u>more than three</u> challenges, they did not complete the balance of the questionnaire.

For a list of challenged items cited by respondents, see "Limiting What Students Shall Read," Appendix B.

After listing three titles (challenged because of crime, violence, language and nudity, one district-level library-supervisor commented: "There are many more titles that do not qualify for our schools. The vast majority of 'challenges' in our school district have come from our professional media personnel; they have been heavily engaged in reviewing 'sample' books from publishing houses. We handle these 'challenges' internally and solve our problems 'quietly.' By reviewing the new 'sample' books, we are able to 'contain' censorship problems; our patrons are pleased to know that we have been involved this way."

One principal wrote: "Do not remember [titles]--books were deleted as objections came in."

---

27. What was the grade level of the challenged material? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages N*	%
K & lower elementary	96	16.7%
Upper elementary	137	23.8%
Junior high	159	27.6%
Senior high	184	31.9%
Total	576	100.0%

As reported by both main subgroups (all administrators and all librarians), the frequency of challenges increases steadily with increasing grade level. (The gradient, though still observable, is less smooth for the building- and district-level subgroups than for the total sample, however.) The censorship pressure on upper-grade materials may be even greater than indicated here, since the survey sample appears to be somewhat weighted toward the lower grades (see above, comments on question 9). These factors may help to explain why the rates of censorship pressures reported in this survey are lower than those reported in the 1977 NCTE survey.

---

*NOTE: Here and in all items through question 51, an asterisk is used to denote when N is the sum of responses, not respondents (many respondents answered on more than one case).

28. If you have a selection policy, was it followed in the selection of this material?

Responses	Percentages (N=422*)
Yes	79.9%
No	20.1%

There was a considerable spread between the responses of principals and librarians. Principals indicated that their selection policy had been followed in only 68.8 percent of the cases they reported, as compared with 87.5 percent of the challenges reported by building-level librarians.

---

29. Was the educational rationale for using this material made known to parents or other members of the school community before the material was challenged?

Responses	Percentages (N=472*)
Yes	21.4%
No	78.6%

Again, there was a sizable spread between responses of the subgroups in the sample. Nearly 30 percent of the principals responded "YES", as compared to 11.1 percent of the building-level librarians.

---

30. To which part(s) of the material did the challenger object?

Responses	Percentages (N= 501*)
Illustrations or images (only)	12.8%
Text or narration (only)	75.8%
Both illustrations and text	11.4%

What were alleged to be the objectionable aspects of the challenged material? (Please indicate by giving the parenthetical numbers corresponding to the aspects listed in Question 25.)

As in question 25, respondents indicated that challengers cited a broad range of objectionable aspects, with "dirty words," obscenity, and aspects related to sex and sexuality predominating. Several respondents noted that challengers cited "all" aspects.

Among the specific aspects noted were the following:

"Concepts and language not suitable for elementary students."
"Support of apartheid in South Africa."
"Slavery." "Religious presentation."
"Drinking alcohol."
"How to have sexual intercourse."
"References to ethnic beliefs."
"Felt better text available."
"Profits of book went to NOW."
"A teacher objected to the language and sex in the book for the junior high level."
"Ogre ate children."
"Superintendent and principal believed sexual situations discussed not suitable for high school students."
"Board member was a fundamentalist minister, who challenged the glorification of war."
"Specific sexual references and language."
"Material put parents in bad light."
"Material was negative rather than positive."
"Violence!"
"Vivid child abuse."
"Ridicule of mentally retarded."
"Intermixing of religious symbolism and language; nudity."
"This novel is a mix of bad 'street' language and crime."
"Simply didn't want materials in library."
"Did not want sex education or human sexuality to be taught."
"Curse words."
"Alleged 'Humanism' philosophy--mention of death in material."
"Right to be free--challenges family unity."
"Offensive topic to members of the German Club (local civic organization); namely 'anti-semitism.'"
"Pictures of near nudity."

---

31. Who initiated the challenge?

Responses	Percentages (N=390)
Individual, representing him/herself	77.9%
Individual, representing a group	16.7%
Group	5.4%

Please specify (check all that apply):

Responses	Percentages (N=423*)
School board member(s)	6.4%
District-level administrator(s)	2.4%
Building-level administrator(s)	5.7%
Librarians(s)	3.5%
Teacher(s)	9.4%
Student(s)	2.4%
Parent(s)	52.3%
Clergy	4.7%
Community resident(s)	9.2%
P.T.A.	0.5%
Other local group(s)	2.8%
State group(s)	0.0%
National group(s)	0.2%
Other group(s) or individual(s)	0.5%

Administrators' and librarians' groups responded very similarly on the first part of this question, but somewhat differently in specifying challengers. Both groups reported that parents were the most frequent challengers. But the frequency of parent challenges reported by the two groups varied, as did the rate at which other individuals or groups were cited. The principal challengers reported by the two groups of respondents ranked as follows (see next page):

Challengers cited by Administrators (N=207*) (ranked by percentages)	%
Parent(s)	60.8%
Community resident(s)	9.7%
School board member(s)	7.7%
Teacher(s)	6.8%
Clergy	5.8%

Challengers cited by Librarians (N=216*) (ranked by percentages)	%
Parent(s)	44.0%
Teacher(s)	12.0%
Building-level administrator(s)	10.2%
Community resident(s)	8.8%
Librarian(s)	5.5%
School board member(s)	5.1%
District-level administrator(s)	4.2%

Note that librarians reported school personnel (teachers, administrators, and librarians) as initiating 31.9 percent of the challenges cited, whereas administrators reported school personnel as initiating only 9.7 percent of the challenges.

Local groups cited by respondents as initiating challenges included Concerned Citizens and Parents to Watch Our Schools ("a new coalition of advisory groups").

---

32. Did any of the local media report or editorialize on the incident?

Responses	Percentages (N=513*)
Yes	15.2%
No	84.8%

IF YES, what position was taken?

Responses	Percentages (N=89*)
Remained neutral on the issue	40.4%
Defended the use of the challenged materials	29.2%
Opposed the use of the challenged materials	7.9%
Positions varied	19.1%
Other(s)	3.4%

Administrators reported media coverage somewhat more frequently (17.6 percent) than librarians (12.4 percent).

Although only 78 respondents answered YES to the first part of the question, there were 89 responses to the second part--some respondents apparently checked more than one answer (percentages are therefore based on the total number of responses). In the majority of cases where the local media were involved, they either remained neutral (40.4 percent of the total) or defended the use of the challenged material (29.2 percent).

Media opposition to the use of challenged materials was reported somewhat more frequently by administrators (10.5 percent) than by librarians (3.1 percent). This difference may relate to the "captive-audience" distinction between the classroom and the library. For an example of local newspaper coverage of a school book controversy, see Appendix B.

---

33. Had the person(s) who initiated the challenge read or viewed the challenged material in its entirety?

Responses	Percentages (N=510*)
Yes	45.5%
No	31.8%
Not sure	22.7%

Figures reported above are for all respondents. Percentages within subgroups varied somewhat. Over a fourth (27.0 percent) of the librarians replied "Not sure," as compared with fewer than a fifth (19.0 percent) of the administrators.

---

34. Did the person(s) challenging the material refer to arguments or viewpoints developed by individuals or groups from outside the community?

Percentages (by group of respondents)

	P (N=91)	S (N=177)	Total A: (N=268)	B-L (N=33)	L-S (N=208)	Total L: (N=241)	Sum (A+L) (N=509)
Responses							
Yes	18.7%	24.9%	22.8%	3.0%	11.5%	10.4%	16.9%
No	68.1%	61.0%	63.4%	90.9%	72.6%	75.4%	69.0%
Not sure	13.2%	14.1%	13.8%	6.1%	15.9%	14.5%	14.1%

IF YES, please specify the group or individual, if known.

Two interpretations of the differing responses are possible. Building-level personnel may be less aware of outside groups than district personnel. Or it may be that outside pressure groups and organized challenges are concentrated on the higher administrative levels, where they can achieve a broader impact. (The latter would be borne out by the state-level survey, which reveals considerable activity by outside groups such as the Gablers' "Educational Research Analysts.")

Respondents specified the following groups or individuals:
"Gablers."
"Concerned Citizens."
"States of Oregon, West Virginia, Texas Citizens' Groups."
"Ethnic Chinese group."
"Eagle Forum."
"Creationists out of Berkeley, Calif."
"No names were given, but we were sure they followed judgments of fundamentalist groups."
"Nevada alternates and observers - International Women's Year Conference."
"Baptist group in Lyunchburg, VA."
"Gablers of Texas."
"Citizens for True Freedom."
"CORE and NAACP."
"John Birch Society."
"Other cities (Philadelphia) that had bannad book."
"Guardians of Education."
"Anglican-Catholic Church."
"Veterans organizations and publications."
"The Gablers; Sex Education Research."
"Pro-Family."
"PTA; Educational TV."
"Suspect written material from Southern church affiliation."
"Extreme right group."
"Mrs. Gabler's review and Protest Committee."
In addition, a number of respondents indicated "Church" or "Church group" (unspecified).

---

35. Which did the challenger(s) seek to do:

Responses	Percentages (N=452*)
Expand the information and viewpoints in the materials used and/or introduce new points of view	5.3%
Limit the information and viewpoints in the materials used	94.7%

From the perspective of concern over censorship, this is one of the most significant items in the survey. The vast majority of respondents in both groups indicated that challengers most often sought to limit, rather than to expand, materials used in the schools. Building-level librarians reported that all of the challenges which they reported on for the period since September 1, 1978, sought to "limit the information and viewpoints in the materials used."

---

36. How was the challenge dealt with?

Responses	Percentages (N=508*)
Informally	60.4%
Through formal procedures	39.6%

Figures given above are for all respondents. Sizable differences appeared in the subgroups' responses, however. Building-level respondents more often replied that challenges were dealt with "informally" (principals, 73.1 percent; building-librarians, 75.7 percent) than did district-level respondents (superintendents, 50.3 percent; library-supervisors, 60.4 percent).

Regional Breakdown. The highest rate of informal resolution of challenges was reported by librarians from the South (76.1 percent); the lowest rate by librarians in the Northeast (46.7 percent).

The breakdown by adoption category yielded differing figures for the two groups of respondents on this question. Whereas 54.7 percent of the administrators' responses in the adoption states and 60.4 percent in the open states indicated "informally," 69.1 percent of the librarians' responses in the adoption states, and 58.5 percent in the open states so indicated.

---

37. Was the challenged material altered, restricted, or removed prior to a formal review?

Responses	Percentages (N=500*)
Yes	50.0%
No	50.0%

Overall, respondents indicated that, in exactly half of the 500 incidents reported on, restrictive action was taken before a formal review. Librarians reported such action more frequently (55.0 percent) than administrators (45.4 percent). (One librarian circled "removed," and noted "by superintendent.") The reported rates of such action were also higher among building-level respondents in both groups (principals, 55.6 percent; building-level librarians, 66.7 percent) than among district-level respondents (superintendents, 40.1 percent; library-supervisors, 53.0 percent).

Regional Breakdown. The highest rates of censorship prior to formal review were reported by librarians from the South (76.1 percent), librarians from the adoption states (67.7 percent), and administrators from the South (65.7 percent); the lowest rate, by administrators from the Northeast (35.5 percent).

E. Resolution of Challenges

38. Did any school or community groups or individuals actively support or oppose the challenge?

Responses	Percentages (N=511*)
Yes	26.4%
No	73.6%

IF YES, please specify (check all that apply):

School board member(s)	Student(s)
Superintendent	Lawyer(s)
District-level administrator(s)	Clergy
Building-level administrator(s)	Business person(s)
Librarian(s)	Senior citizen(s)
Teacher(s)	Civic leader(s)
Teachers' organization	Other group(s) or individual(s)
Parent(s)	

Administrators and librarians responded similarly here.

Among "other groups(s) or individuals(s)," one respondent noted: "Black educators."

For each challenge reported on, respondents were asked, in the second part of the question, to identify the groups or individuals who took an active role in either supporting or opposing the challenge and to specify which side they were on. The individuals or groups most frequently cited as taking an active role ranked as follows (N = number of incidents):

Groups or Individuals Who Supported or Opposed Challenges	N
Librarians	103
Building-level administrators	89
Teachers	81
Parents	80
School board members	78
District-level administrators	58
Superintendents	52
Clergy	32
Students	30
Teachers' organizations	26

Nature of involvement

Librarians -- in 64.1 percent of the cases overall in which librarians were cited as taking an active part, they were reported to have opposed the challenge. The rate reported by administrators was slightly lower (60.9 percent) than that reported by librarians (66.7 percent).

Building-level administrators -- in 59.5 percent of the cases overall in which building-level administrators were cited, they were reported to have opposed the challenge. However, there was a considerable spread between the administrators' responses (67.3 percent) and the librarians' (50.0 percent) on this item.

Teachers -- in 61.7 percent of all cases in which teachers were cited, they were reported to have opposed the challenge. Administrators' and librarians' responses were (65.0 and 57.6 percent, respectively.

Parents -- in 55.0 percent of the cases in which parents took an active part, they were reported to have supported the challenge. Administrators' and librarians' responses were closely comparable on this item.

School board members -- in 59.0 percent overall of the cases in which school board members were indicated as taking an active part, they were reported to have supported the challenge. Administrators' and librarians' responses (61.0 and 56.0 percent, respectively) differed only slightly.

District-level administrators -- in 58.6 percent of the cases overall in which district administrators were cited as involved, they were reported to have opposed the challenge. However, the two groups of respondents replied inversely on this item: administrators checked opposed the challenge in 67.6 percent of the cases, while librarians checked supported the challenge in 57.1 percent of the cases.

Superintendent -- in 57.7 percent of the cases overall in which superintendents were involved, they were reported to have supported the challenge. However, slightly over half (51.5 percent) of the administrators' responses indicated opposed the challenge, while nearly three-fourths (73.7 percent) of the librarians' responses indicated supported the challenge.

---

39. If a teacher, administrator, or other school personnel openly defended the use of the challenged material, what was his/her length of service prior to the challenge? (Please answer for the key person in each case.)

Responses	Percentages		
	A (N=144*)	L (N=118*)	A+L (N=262*)
Less than 2 years	11.1%	7.6%	9.5%
2-5 years	17.4%	33.9%	24.8%
5-15 years	52.8%	36.4%	45.5%
More than 15 years	18.8%	22.0%	20.2%

Before any conclusions can be drawn from these data, the distribution of length of service in the population should be considered.

---

40. On what ground(s) was the use of the challenged material defended? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages (N=400*)
Legal/Constitutional	15.5%
Educational	75.8%
Other	8.7%

In the majority (75.8 percent) of the 400 cases reported on, respondents indicated that the use of the challenged material was defended on educational grounds. Legal/constitutional grounds were cited somewhat more often by librarians (19.0 percent) than by administrators (12.8 percent)--a difference which may be partly due to the "captive audience" legal distinctions between the classroom and the library. Under other grounds, respondents cited the following:

"Book on list recommended by state library."
"Leisure-recreation."
"Outside reading."
"Moral."
"Inappropriate."
"Concepts and language not suitable for elementary students."

---

41. Was anyone assigned to reevaluate the challenged material?

Responses	Percentages		
	A (N=247*)	L (N=218*)	A+L (N=465*)
Yes	60.3%	46.3%	53.8%
No	39.7%	53.7%	46.2%

IF YES, please specify (check all that apply):

School board member(s)
Superintendent
Assistant superintendent(s)
Director of curriculum and instruction
Director of media center
Curriculum specialist(s)
Instructional specialist(s)
Librarian(s)
Principal(s)
Assistant principal(s)
Department head(s)
Teacher(s)
Parent(s)
Student(s)
Civic leader(s)
Other(s)

The persons most frequently reported as being assigned to reevaluate challenged materials ranked, by frequency of responses, as follows:

As Reported by Administrators	%	As Reported by Librarians	%	As Reported by All Respondents	%
Principal(s)	17.5%	Librarian(s)	22.1%	Librarian(s)	17.4%
Librarian(s)	14.7%	Principal(s)	15.0%	Principal(s)	16.5%
Teacher(s)	14.5%	Teacher(s)	12.5%	Teacher(s)	13.7%
Parent(s)	7.7%	Director of media center	10.7%	Director of media center	8.6%
Director of media center	7.3%	Parent(s)	8.2%	Parent(s)	7.9%

42. Were the publisher (or producer) and/or author(s) given an opportunity to defend the material?

Responses	Percentages		
	A (N=261*)	L (N=229*)	A+L (N=490*)
Yes	3.4%	11.8%	7.3%
No	96.6%	88.2%	92.7%

In the vast majority of incidents (92.7 percent overall), the publisher, producer, and/or author(s) were not given an opportunity to defend the challenged material. The negative response rate of the administrators was even higher--96.6 percent, as compared with 88.2 percent for the librarians.

---

43. At what administrative level was the challenge resolved?

Responses (ranked by percentages within each group of respondents):

Administrators (N=269*)	%	Librarians (N=224*)	%	All respondents (N=493*)	%
Principal	26.3%	Principal	34.0%	Principal	29.9%
Superintendent	24.2%	Librarian	17.0%	Superintendent	19.5%
Local School board	22.7%	Superintendent	13.8%	Local school board	16.2%
[More than one response checked]	7.8%	Local school board	8.5%	Librarian	10.5%
Other	7.4%	Department head	7.1%	Other	7.3%
Librarian	5.2%	Other	7.1%	[More than one response checked]	6.5%
Department head	2.6%	Case still pending	5.4%	Department head	4.7%
Teacher	1.9%	[More than one response checked]	4.9%	Case still pending	3.4%
Case still pending	1.9%	Teacher	2.2%	Teacher	2.0%

The percentages given above are based on the number of challenges reported on (many respondents reported on more than one challenge).

IF CASE IS STILL PENDING, please skip to question 46.

44. What was the final diposition of the incident with regard to the challenged material?

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=513*)
Challenge overruled	34.6%
Removal from school	22.2%
Alternate assignment offered at parents' request	8.4%
Use restricted to professional staff or certain ages or grades	7.0%
Removal from recommended list	4.3%
Parental permission required for use	3.1%
Use restricted to specific courses or classes	3.1%
Not reordered	3.1%
Destruction of material	2.7%
Moved from classroom to library	2.3%
Cutting, editing, or marking out of "objectionable" material	1.9%
Refusal to purchase	1.2%
Limited purchase	0.8%
Special edition ordered	0.6%
Other	4.7%

Administrators' and librarians' responses varied no more than a few percentage points on each item. However, the librarians' responses in nearly all cases tended toward more, rather than less, restrictive action. The item for which the spread between responses from the two groups was greatest (5.5 percent) was "alternate assignment offered at parents' request" (administrators, 10.8 percent; librarians, 5.3 percent). Such action would be more likely to occur in relation to the classroom than the library.

Other dispositions cited by respondents included the following:

"Always use alternative material."

"Several students didn't participate in drama production; therefore, no production."

"Other materials being added."

"Plans were to change textbook prior to complaint."

One respondent noted that the challenged material (Johnny May) was "moved from the library to junior high English classroom."

"We agreed it was inappropriate for grade level."

One district librarian commented that the challenged materials were "to be taken off shelves." In answer to the question of how the incident had affected the educational process, the same respondent noted: "It made me irritated."

"Student will be given warning on the nature of the book before letting him/her select this from the reading list."

"Let it die--person objecting refused to return book."

"The principal found the book [Clifton, Amifika] offensive (she's black) and demanded it be taken out of her library. She wanted (suggested) it be removed from all libraries in our system and planned to write ALA. I don't think she ever got around to it. We didn't remove it from our buildings."

"Parent happy after seeing favorable reviews."

"A piece of adult porno--(really) purchased by mistake, by a teacher." "We agreed--parents, librarians, teachers, administrators--that the material was not suitable. No question. Junked it."

"Forever, in a K-5 school, not appropriate in early elementary--a mistake, really."

"Publisher notified of School/Parent Objections."

Parents "stole material." [challenge had been overruled]

"Librarian had not previously read and agreed not suitable for junior high."

"Desire for sex education not resolved--no solution."

---

45. On what ground(s) was the resolution of the challenge based? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages (N=448*)
Administrative	21.9%
Financial	1.3%
Legal/Constitutional	6.5%
Educational	64.1%
Other	6.2%

Administrators and librarians responded similarly. The percentages given above are for both groups combined. The majority of responses (64.1 percent) indicated that the resolution of the challenge was based on educational grounds; just over a fifth (21.9 percent) cited administrative grounds; while only 6.5 percent cited legal/constitutional grounds.

Other grounds cited included the following:

"Material in poor taste."

"Need for more materials."

"Moral."

"Too much sex."

"Public relations."

"Contrary to individual philosophy."

F. REPERCUSSIONS OF CHALLENGES

46. If use of the challenged material was at any point abridged in any way, was other material selected or acquired to replace it?

Responses	Percentages (N=358*)
Yes	9.8%
No	90.2%

IF YES, please identify.

The high negative response (90.2 percent) to this question offers further indication (see also questions 35 and 44 above) that the net effect of pressures on materials selection in the schools is to narrow the range and variety of materials available to students.

---

47. Did the incident result in the firing, resignation under pressure, removal, or failure to be reappointed (or re-elected) of any school personnel?

	Administrators		Librarians		All Respondents	
Responses	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	4	1.5	6	2.6	10	2.0
No	261	98.5	223	97.4	484	98.0
Total	265	100.0	229	100.0	494	100.0

IF YES, who was affected?

Responses	Administrators	Librarians
School board member(s)	—	—
Superintendent	—	2
Principal(s)	—	—
Assistant principal(s)	—	—
Department head(s)	—	—
Librarian(s)	1	—
Teacher(s)	2	—
Other(s)	1	—

In two of the six cases cited by librarians, superintendents were reported to be affected. In the other four cases, the respondents did not identify the personnel--a failure that may perhaps indicate a climate of fear. (See also question 49 below.)

Because some respondents reported on more than one challenge, it is possible that some of these cases refer to the same personnel, rather than separate individuals.

---

48. In your view, how has the incident affected the educational process in your school(s)?

Responses	Percentages (N=538*)
Too soon to tell	7.8%
No effect	57.4%
Influenced teaching content and/or style	7.1%
Influenced selection of materials	22.5%
Altered students' attitudes toward materials	3.2%
Other(s)	2.0%

Administrators answered "no effect" with greater frequency (61.9 percent of all responses) than librarians (52.5 percent). Otherwise, the two groups' responses were closely comparable. Percentages given above are based on the total number of responses for both groups combined.

Other effects cited by respondents included the following:
"Provided principal with an opportunity to act with support to overrule challenge."
"We plan to establish a parent-teacher review group."
"Teacher resigned."
"Students became more active."
"We plan to establish a parent-teacher review group."

---

49. Did court action result from the incident?

Yes No

IF YES, please indicate which court:

State
Federal

Librarians reported that court action resulted from 4 out of the 224 challenges (1.8 percent) they cited--as compared to 2 out of the 264 challenges (0.8 percent) reported by administrators.

Both of the court actions reported by administrators were in state courts. One of the court actions reported by librarians was in federal court. The other three actions were not specified. Here again, one wonders whether the failure of librarian respondents to give specific information indicates a climate of fear or insecurity.

One respondent noted that a State Education Department hearing was pending.

How has the case been decided?

Challenge to material sustained
Challenge to material overruled
Case still pending
Other

Computer data for this item are invalid, as a considerable number of respondents answered it even though they had checked NO in the first part of the question. Apparently, they were responding here on the outcome of the challenge, rather than on the outcome of a court case. (The questionnaires would have to be reexamined to retrieve this information.)

---

50. How have parents responded to the resolution of the challenge?

Responses	Percentages (N=472*)
No response	76.1%
Restricted children's access to controversial materials	7.2%
Restricted children's participation in certain class activities	4.0%
Written protests	3.8%
Demonstrations	1.1%
Removed children from school	1.7%
Other(s)	6.1%

Administrators' and librarians' responses were closely comparable (greatest spread was 5 percentage points).

In eight incidents (1.7 percent of the total) cited by respondents, parents removed their children from school.

---

51. Have there been any other repercussions in the school(s) and/or the community?

Responses	Percentages (N=480*)
Yes	5.0%
No	95.0%

IF YES, please briefly list (attach additional sheet of paper, if necessary).

Write-in responses included the following:

"District resolved problem to satisfaction of community and staff. District came out very strong. Used broad-based committee to study entire human development curriculum."

"School board members who attempted to censor reading for all students were not re-elected."

"Students wrote about challenge in the school paper and started a collection to renew the magazines. Also went to talk to the Principal who originated the challenge, and finally overruled his decision and renewed the magazines with the money they collected."

"Parental badgering has caused rifts between teachers and administrators. Extreme care is taken in selecting any material. Teachers are afraid to bring in 'controversial' subjects."

"A Fundamental Baptist School has been started in a local church with roughly 30 students in attendance. They have joined a group of Baptist Schools in the Midwest challenging the requirement of giving the State information on Teacher qualifications and student enrollment using the separation of church and state as their premise."

"The local pressures from this situation and the harassment of the superintendent was a major factor in this person taking another job. Our entire human growth program has been challenged as being improper for not teaching morals. A small group of people with very fundamental ideas is keeping the situation alive."

"Student did not support parent."

"Latest case, but really as a result of the pressure group the local teachers' association has requested a review of the general situation by their state Professional Rights and Responsibilities Committee."

"The college faculty and library staff who have learned of this happening in their community have rallied to support the local high school's intellectual freedom if needed."

"Right now the repercussion is coming from me. In my opinion the Association of American Publishers is allowing too much offensive material to be presented to schools. Keep the material clean and morally high in quality. Free sex, stories on homosexuals, situation ethics and other such garbage should not be placed in schools. Throw the junk in the waste basket. Bad literature and bad televison are powerful aids in tearing down the American Ideal."

---

52. Would you be willing to be contacted for a further, in-depth study in the follow-up phase of this project?

Responses	Percentages		
	Administrators (N=1,110)	Librarians (N=482)	All Respondents (N=1,592)
Yes	30.5%	48.1%	35.9%
No	69.5%	51.9%	64.1%

IF YES, please give your name and address in the space provided below.

Some of the respondents who answered No indicated they felt they did not have much to contribute: "No big deal - we're a small town." Others suggested that their experience would be of little interest because they had had no serious problems.

One weary respondent simply pleaded: "Enough already."

PLEASE REMEMBER TO ENCLOSE, IF AVAILABLE, A COPY OF YOUR POLICY FOR SELECTING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES FOR RECONSIDERING MATERIALS THAT HAVE BEEN CHALLENGED.

Only 613 administrators and 339 librarians responded to this item, as compared to the 666 administrators and 419 librarians who indicated, in answer to question 7, that they have a formal selection policy. Of the totals responding here, over half (54.6 percent) of the librarians indicated that they were enclosing a copy of their selection policy, reconsideration procedures, or both, while fewer than a third (32.0 percent) of the administrators so indicated.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

The following miscellaneous comments by respondents were not specifically addressed to any particular item on the questionnaire:

"[District Librarian:] I have more trouble with the teachers and principals than the parents."

"All [challenges] were routine and handled by our re-evaluation policy without incident."

"The only thing we have had in the past 3 years are two different parents who brought books to me from our library. They were selected by the librarian, who had not read them. They were pure trash with no redeeming literary and educational value and were thrown out."

"Book challenged pulled from circulation."

"This incident would have no value to anyone. An angry parent just wanted to cause trouble if he could. No problems."

"No challenge. Took book out of library and destroyed it."

Noted one principal: "I have had 3-4 books and one magazine brought to me by staff members for the above reasons [obscenity, "dirty words," "nudity," and profanity]. We removed them from the shelves. No outside complaints have been made. Our district selection policy was adopted as board policy on 3/17/75."

"We have a very large (6,000) and avant garde collection containing films on pre-marital sex, intercourse, birth control, abortion, anti-war, explicit sex, explicit drugs, genetic manipulation, 4-letter words, psychology, etc., etc., etc. We have been virtually trouble-free, our incidents were minor (and resolved satisfactory for all concerned with no threat to us)."

"Two school board members who attempted to censor reading for all students were not reelected."

A library-supervisor commented: "Relatively few problems. Building selection committees and procedures followed avoid problems."

"One library book was removed from the collection and rightly so. It was a book by a notable author, and was not read before circulating. He goofed and the librarian goofed by buying it."

"Formal 'challenges' not made--suggestions for review made. Discussion with complainant usually relieved the problem."

"With all the good literature available, it would be my hope we could accentuate the best and leave a lot of the questionable stuff off the shelves and the reading lists. Wish the publishers could do a better job of sorting originally."

"Our challenges have come from parents who object to works of fiction which they believe are not appropriate for their children. Most of these parents are members of fundamentalist Churches. We have resolved these challenges by excusing the child from having to read the book."

"[Full Language Arts] Program purchased by Supt., without input from anyone else, viewed as worthless by teachers and principals. Material was viewed as too difficult for pre-high schoolers. Put on shelf and forgotten."

"We have 'teacher' selection committees at the junior and senior high school levels; patrons also serve on these committees. We have (through these committees) developed two guides:

Recommended Novels and Plays--Junior High School.

Recommended Novels and Plays--Senior High School.

"The membership rotates on these book selection committees annually. Our patrons seem to be very pleased with 'committee results' in the selection process.

"A final note: Please understand the philosophical differences which exist between the public library and the school library. School library functions operate under different policies than public libraries. Public school systems do not have to accept, purchase, etc. the broad range of everything that is in print (or non-print). We are very highly selective; we use our professional staff to assist us in sorting out the garbage (and there is more than enough garbage for sale!). As a district library supervisor, I am appalled at the continuous lowering of moral standards which more and more writers are subscribing to in order to make a 'fast buck.' It is notable that many such writers are writing sexy books for children; most of this garbage used to be confined to older students--but now it is being aimed at children. The ALA can rest assured that we will do our utmost to keep decent, clean materials in our schools for the education of our children.

"As you can see--the public schools will purposely participate in enough censorship activities so that we will not become encumbered in these time-and-energy-wasting battles with our patrons over "low" moral-toned books. We have more important things to do in our assignments. We have one major philosophy in this school district's media centers: How will the decisions that I make affect boys and girls?"

See also Appendixes B, C, and D.

Part II

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO SURVEY OF STATE-ADOPTION ADMINISTRATORS

A. Background Information

1. How long have you been in your present administrative post?

Responses	Frequency (N=22)
Less than 2 years	1
2-5 years	6
5-15 years	12
More than 15 years	3

Over two-thirds of the respondents indicated that they had been in their post more than 5 years. The respondent who answered "less than 2 years" indicated that she had assumed the position only a few weeks before receipt of the questionnaire and therefore felt unqualified to complete the other questions.

2. To the best of your knowledge, how does the rate of challenges to materials being considered for adoption for your state during the period since September 1, 1978, compare with the rate of challenges in the two-year period preceding September 1, 1978?

Responses	Frequency (N=20)
Lower	3
About the same	12
Higher	5
Not certain	—

Nearly one-fourth of the state-level respondents indicated that the rate of challenges since September 1, 1978, is higher than the rate for the preceding two-year period. One respondent, who did not check any of the printed responses for this question, wrote: "Challenges usually come at local level after adoption."

3. To your knowledge, in the period since September 1, 1978, have any challenges regarding the adoption of instructional materials affected either the adoption process or the materials adopted for your state?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	9
No	12

IF YES, please indicate which of the following has been affected (check all that apply):

Responses	Frequency
Curriculum content	3
Textbooks adopted	5
Supplementary materials adopted	2
Teaching methodology	1
Adoption policy	4
Adoption procedures	4
Other_____ (Please Specify)	3

Nearly half (9 out of 21) of the state-level respondents indicated that challenges since September 1, 1978, had affected the adoption process or the materials adopted. (Phone interviews indicated that a few respondents were careless about observing the September 1, 1978, cutoff date on this question, however, and that some of the effects they noted resulted from slightly earlier challenges.)

The breakdown of categories affected is listed above. The comments of the three respondents who checked "other" were quite varied:

One administrator, from one of the less populous Western states, wrote: "disruptive to process, but did not alter decision."

A respondent from a major Southern state noted: "The effect of challenges is a continuum--some of the results are negative but many are positive."

The third respondent, from a smaller Southern state, reported that state laws had been modified as a result of challenges.

---

4. Which of the following is included in your state adoptions? (Check all that apply.)

	Frequency		
Responses	Basal Textbooks	Supplementary Print Materials	Nonprint Materials
Elementary	22	11	8
Secondary	19	9	5

Respondents indicated that half of the states "adopt" only basal materials (which sometimes include other than traditional textbooks).

As noted in the comments on question 5 below, however, basal "adoption" is far less restrictive in some states than in others.

---

5. Does your state allow for local options to use state funds to purchase materials not on state adoption lists?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	10
No	9

IF YES, what are the conditions or limitations for such purchases?

To put this question in perspective, it is important to note that the term "adoption" means very different things from state to state (on this, see "Limiting What Students Shall Read").

Respondents noted the following conditions:

"Up to 50% of the district categorical allocations may be spent for instructional materials not on state adoption. (Less than 15% is spent this way."

"Consumables excluded. Very little state money available."

"If the Commission doesn't list textbooks for a subject area, the local unit may go outside the Official List with the approval of the Commissioner of Education."

"Purchases are usually for instructional supplies/and or materials other than the Basal Textbook."

"No limitations so long as funding can be provided by LEAs. [local education agencies]." [Up to 20% of the state allocation can be used for materials not on the state list.]

"30% of textbook funds for pre-processed print and A-V materials." [Won't adopt or reimburse for any blank notebooks, tapes, etc.]

"Pilot materials--one to two years."

"State funds may be used to purchase non-textual supplementary materials."

"Must be approved by the State Board of Education."

"On pilot or field test basis before placing on an adoption list."

---

6. What was the 1979-1980 enrollment in your state's public schools?

The responses to this question are recorded in Table III. Some respondents gave only their total enrollment figure, without elementary-secondary breakdowns.

Table III

Public School Enrollment in States with Statewide Adoption Procedures
[unless otherwise indicated, figures are for 1979-1980]

State	Enrollment		
	Elementary	Secondary	Total
Alabama	410,000	350,000	760,000
Arizona	--	--	--
Arkansas	286,794	137,928	424,722
California	3,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
Florida	—	—	1,542,897
Georgia	—	—	1,100,704
Idaho	110,782 (1-6)	91,976	202,758
Indiana	544,717 (K-6)	505,066	1,081,916 (incl. special ed. 32,133)
Kentucky	470,466	211,629	682,095
Louisiana (1978-79)	590,871	254,942	845,813
Mississippi	270,752	214,032	484,784
Nevada	110,000	50,000	160,000
New Mexico	—	—	260,000
North Carolina	813,500	363,000	1,176,500
Oklahoma	375,195	250,129	625,324
Oregon (1978-79)	307,970	149,843	457,813
South Carolina	--	—	—
Tennessee	641,522 (K-8)	269,825	911,347
Texas	1,646,000 (1-6)	1,359,000	3,005,000
Utah	183,000 (K-6)	140,000	323,000
Virginia	609,905	401,070	1,010,975
West Virginia (1978-79)	233,516	161,753	395,279
Totals	10,604,990	5,910,193	19,450,927

NOTE: Figures are given as reported by respondents, some of whom approximated or rounded figures. (Since elementary-secondary breakdowns were omitted by some respondents, the total for these two categories is less than the cummulative total for all adoption states.)

B. Policies and Procedures

7. What controversial issues are referred to in your state's adoption policy statement? (Check all that apply.)

Responses (ranked from highest to lowest)	Frequency
Racism	13
Sexism	13
Religion	10
Sex and sexuality	10
Minority group representation	8
None	7
Ageism	7
Scientific theories_____ (Please specify)	4
Other(s)_____ (Please specify)	12

All four respondents who noted that their policy statements refer to scientific theories specified the issue of evolution vs. creation.

Other controversial issues reported in state adoption policies included the following (bracketed comments are based on follow-up phone interviews):

"Language." [Violence, Life Styles, Citizenship]
"No textbook shall be used...which speaks slightingly of the founders of the republic..."
"Represent fairly and accurately of the current achievements of all groups."
"General non-bias."
"Profanity and Obscenity."
[Citizenship, democracy, free enterprise, etc.]
"All are considered as a part of the evaluation process."
"Not demeaning to any individual or group--must recognize equal rights, cultural diversity."
"Environment, conservation, dangerous substances, etc."
"Color, national origin, ancestry, occupational."
"We are considering all of these."
"Free enterprise system."
"Handicapped."

---

8. Does your state inform parents and other state residents about its policies and procedures for adopting instructional materials?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	19
No	2

IF YES, how?

Only the Kentucky and Louisiana respondents indicated that their states do not inform parents and other residents about selection policies and procedures.

Provisions for informing state residents which were listed by other respondents were the following:

"Per inquiries or news articles."
"We have a handbook that is circulated to patrons upon request."
"Through media releases."
"We have developed slide/tape presentation and Handbook. These resources are available to local school systems for use in the community. We have done several radio and TV shows, and made presentations to a variety of professional and civic groups. We will be making a special for educational television during the coming year."
"State and district instructional materials councils must have lay members--meetings are open and advertised--district displays of material being considered."
"Upon request and through county boards of education."
"News media--local school superintendents."
"Handbook-news releases."
"One parent serves on each adoption committee."
"Committee (adoption) report, newspapers, news magazine."
"Mailings and news releases."
"Proclamation calling for bids on textbooks, advertisement in several newspapers of the call, statewide news release."

C. Evaluation and Adoption of Textbooks and Instructional Materials

9. Who is responsible for evaluating and recommending textbooks and other instructional materials for your state adoptions?

Responses	Frequency
One committee for all materials	8
Separate committees for different disciplines	10
Other_____ (Please specify)	5

_____

The non-participating state (see above, question 1) was included in this tally, with information taken from the state guidelines. One respondent checked both "separate committees for different disciplines" and "other" (which explains why there were a total of 23 responses, rather than 22)--specifying "subject area supervisory personnel of Department of Education." The other four respondents who checked "other" specified the following:

"Elementary textbook committee only."

"Subject area supervisory personnel of Department of Education. Curriculum and Instruction committee of State Board of Education."

"Members of the Commission utilize different committees each year to evaluate the textbooks."

"Classroom teachers and districts."

"Seven commissioners--each with up to 100 committees."

---

10. Is the composition of your adoption committee(s) stipulated in your adoption procedures?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	18
No	2

IF YES, please indicate both the breakdown and the total number of members per committee:

College or university personnel
School administrators
Supervisors
Curriculum consultants
Classroom teachers
Civic leaders
Parents
Other(s)_____
(Please Specify)

The range of responses here was very broad. See the discussion of adoption procedures in "Limiting What Students Shall Read."

---

11. Are provisions made for publishers' or nonprint producers' representatives to present proposed submissions to your state adoption committee(s)?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	19
No	3

IF YES, how? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Frequency
Group hearings (with other representatives) before committee	3
Individual hearings before committee	12
Private meetings with individual committee members	10
Other_____ (Please specify)	1

The respondent who checked "other" noted: "All hearings are open--with few exceptions, competitors do not elect to be present for others' presentations."

All but the Nevada, Indiana, and Utah respondents indicated that provisions were made for publishers' representatives to present submissions to the state adoption committee(s).

---

12. Are provisions made for special interest groups to present their views on textbooks and instructional materials to the state adoption committee(s)?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	14
No	7

IF YES, what sort of provisions?

Two-thirds of the respondents indicated that their state made provisions for special-interest groups to present their views to the state adoption committee(s). The following provisions were noted:

"Request received at least two weeks in advance or written presentation received two weeks in advance of hearing."

"Elementary only--upon request."

"Public hearings provide an opportunity for these groups to address the textbook commission."

"Contact committee, adoption committees."

"Correspondence may (or may not) be presented by chairman to committee."

"Written and oral input and public hearings."

"Hearings before the state textbook committee and Commissioner of Education."

"By appointment and request through the textbook administrator for Idaho."

"Upon request and being placed on the agenda."

"An open hearing before the State Board Subcommittee on instructional material prior to adoption."

"Complainants are required to submit to the Commission their objections (a statement form is being developed) in writing. Complaints are examined and the individual or group may be invited to present in person their concerns at the next meeting of the State Textbook Commission. A formal policy and procedure is being developed for approval by the Commission during 1980."

"To committee, commission, and State Board of Education."

---

13. Are provisions made for authors, publishers, or producers to defend materials challenged during the adoption process?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	12
No	7

IF YES, how?

Responses	Frequency
In writing only	2
In person, before committee or individuals responsible for reconsideration	7
Other _____ (Please specify)	6

More than two-thirds of the respondents indicated that provisions are made for publishers to defend materials challenged during the adoption process. In addition to the provisions specified above, respondents checking "other" noted the following:

"Special-interest groups present challenges prior to publishers' presenting materials to Committee--Publishers/authors respond during presentation."

"No formal provision--but all meetings are open in Indiana."

"No challenges have been made."

"Depends on situation."

"Would be made if needed."

"Coordinator intercedes for publisher; if necessary, coordinator contacts publisher."

---

14. If potentially controversial materials are adopted in your state, are any provisions made to explain them to parents and other lay members of the community at the time of adoption?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	9
No	11

IF YES, what sort of provisions?

Nearly half of the respondents indicated that their state made no provisions to explain potentially controversial materials to parents and other lay citizens at the time of adoption. (Some of these respondents noted that such provisions were more likely at the local level, where final selection occurs.)

The respondents answering YES to this question specified the following provisions:

"This is a local responsibility in our state."
"Adoption decisions are made at the state level. Purchase decisions are made at the local level. All materials must be evaluated according to locally adopted policies prior to purchase."
"All committee meetings are 'open meetings.'"
"District assumes responsibility."
"Not a state function--counties provide this."
"This is left to local districts."
"Written information to superintendents."
"We try to avoid controversial materials--i.e., 'four-letter words,' etc."
"Handled as the situation arises."
"Each school district is sent a review of adopted materials by TEA."
"Patrons are asked to file a written grievance."
"Local districts select from state list of 10 books, and have sole responsibility for textbook use at local level."
"Copies of evaluations are made available on request along with publisher responses."

IF, IN THE PERIOD SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1978, THERE HAVE BEEN NO CHALLENGES TO INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR STATE ADOPTION, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 30.

D. Challenges to Instructional Materials under Consideration for State Adoption

15. In the period since September 1, 1978, what has been the extent of challenges to instructional materials under consideration for state adoption in the various disciplines?

Responses		Frequency			
		Number of Challenges			
		None	Few	Average	Many
(a)	Elementary-level Language Arts	1	2	2	0
(b)	Secondary-level Language Arts	1	1	2	1
(c)	Foreign Languages	4	0	0	0
(d)	Social Studies	0	5	2	2
(e)	Science	0	5	1	2
(f)	Math	3	1	0	0
(g)	Health Education	2	3	1	1
(h)	Other_____ (Please specify)	1	1	0	2

The number of responses in each category are given above. More challenges were reported in relation to social studies and math than in the other disciplines. However, responses to this question (as well as the next) would have been dependent largely on each state's particular adoption cycle during the recent period. Since most states have adoption cycles of about five years, the period "since September 1, 1978" defined in the questionnaire would not have covered the whole spectrum of subjects in each state. It may therefore be inappropriate to draw any firm conclusions, from these data, about the relative frequency of challenges in the various disciplines.

16. What were alleged to be the objectionable aspects of the challenged materials? (Check all that apply.)

Responses (ranked by frequency)	Frequency
"Secular humanism"	7
Darwinism, evolution	7
Scientific theories	6
Criticism of U.S. history	6
Values clarification	6
"Undermining of traditional family"	6
Atheistic or agnostic views	6
Antitraditional/antiestablishment views	5
Negative or pessimistic view	5
Moral relativism or situation ethics	5
Religious bias	4
Homosexuality	4
Explicit discussion of drugs and drug abuse	4

Invasion of personal privacy	4
Emphasis on psychology or feelings	4
Sexism	3
Obscenity	3
"Dirty words"	3
Abortion	3
Violence	3
Profanity	3
Explicit representation of sex	3
Internationalism	3
Death and dying	3
Racism	2
Minority representation	2
Nudity	2
The occult	2
Pagan studies	2
"Questionable" or "subversive" authors	2
Ageism	1
Realism	1
Atrocities	1
Substandard English usage or dialect	1
Ethnic studies	--
Other(s)	7

The wording of this item was kept identical with question 25 on the local-level survey, so that data from the two sets of respondents could be compared. Both local and state-level respondents indicated that the range of aspects challenged is extremely broad. It should be noted, however, that on the state level the ranking of responses would have been at least partly influenced by the particular subjects up for adoption in the recent period. For example, challenges related to Darwinism and evolution are most likely to occur during the biology or science adoption cycles--or, in some states, social studies (the creationist view of the origin of life is sometimes incorporated into the social studies curriculum).

That caveat should be kept in mind when one compares the ranking of responses to this question by state- and local-level survey participants. Whereas concerns with sex, obscenity, and profanity dominated the objections on the local level, on the state level such objections were reported less frequently than the more complex issues such as "secular humanism" and evolution, cited rather infrequently on the local level.

Please respond, in questions 17-28, ON THE CHALLENGES WHICH HAVE CREATED THE GREATEST CONTROVERSY. Treat each challenge as a separate case. (You will probably find it easiest to answer the questions, in order, for one case at a time, rather than for all cases at once.)

IF YOU WISH TO RESPOND ON MORE THAN THREE CHALLENGES, please photocopy the balance of this questionnaire for additional responses.

17. Please identify the challenged items, and indicate to what discipline each belongs (giving the appropriate letter from the left of the list in question 15).

The majority of respondents indicated that state-level challenges during the adoption process generally involve all the titles under consideration, and that it would be misleading to cite specific challenged items. This is in marked contrast to the situation on the local level, where respondents indicated that challengers usually do single out specific titles.

One state-level respondent enclosed a sample list of objections presented by a parent during science and health adoption hearings. The objections run to dozens of typewritten pages and touch on most of the titles submitted for adoption during that cycle.

Only one respondent listed specific titles on the questionnaire, as follows: "Selected as examples: Anderson et al, Silver Burdett Social Studies series, 1979. Ryder, Contemporary Living, First edition, 1979. (Home Economics). Gross et al, American Citizenship: The Way We Govern, First Edition, 1979."

Another respondent enclosed a list of titles challenged during a recent social studies adoption (see Appendix B).

---

18. What was the grade level of the challenged material? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Frequency
K & Lower elementary	3
Upper elementary	7
Junior high	8
Senior high	9

Here, as on the local level, responses indicate that the frequency of challenges increases with increasing grade level.

---

19. To which part(s) of the material did the challenger(s) object? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Frequency
Illustrations or images [only]	--
Text or narration [only]	7
[Both responses checked]	4

---

20. Who initiated the challenge?

Responses	Frequency
Individual, representing him/herself	6
Individual, representing a group	11
Group	6

Please specify (check all that apply):

Responses	Frequency
School board member(s)	--
District-level administrator(s)	--
Building-level administrator(s)	--
Librarian(s)	--
Teacher(s)	1
Student(s)	--
Parent(s)	8
Clergy	2
Community resident(s)	5
P.T.A.	--
Other local group(s) _____	6
State group(s) _____	4
National group(s) _____	5
Other group(s) or individual(s) _____ (Please specify)	1

In approximately two-thirds of the recent state-level incidents cited by respondents, the challenge was initiated by either a group or an individual representing a group. This is in marked contrast with the situation on the local level, where over three-fourths of the recent challenges cited were reported to be initiated by individuals acting independently.

Note, too, that 5 out of 32 responses indicated that national groups were involved in initiating the challenge. The influence of national groups was also cited by a number of respondents in other contexts of the survey as well (see question 23, for example).

---

21. Did any of the local media report or editorialize on the challenge?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	13
No	--

IF YES, what position was taken?

Responses	Frequency
Remained neutral on the issue	10
Supported adoption of the challenged materials	2
Opposed adoption of the challenged materials	1
Positions varied	1
Other(s) _____ (Please specify)	1

In all of the recent state-level challenges cited by respondents, there was some media coverage. In the majority of cases (10 out of 15), a neutral stance was maintained.

---

22. Had the person(s) who initiated the challenge read or viewed the challenged material in its entirety?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	6
No	2
Not Sure	6

---

23. Did the person(s) challenging the material refer to arguments or viewpoints developed by individuals or groups from outside the state?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	10
No	4
Not Sure	--

Respondents indicated that the views of out-of-state groups or individuals were referred to in over two-thirds of the recent challenges cited (see "Limiting What Students Shall Read," pp. 15-21, for further discussion of this issue; see also Appendix D).

---

24. Which of the following did the challenger(s) seek to do?

Responses	Frequency
Expand the information and viewpoints in the the materials used and/or introduce new points of view	10
Limit the information and viewpoints in the materials used	9

In contrast with the situation on the local level, where just under 95 percent of the challenges sought to limit information and viewpoints, slightly over half of the recent challenges cited by state-level respondents sought, at least in part, to expand information and viewpoints in the materials under consideration.

(It is important to note that groups like the Creation Research Society generally advocate the addition or inclusion of their own views or materials, rather than the removal of opposing views such as evolutionary theory.)

E. Resolution of Challenges

25. Did any school or community groups or individuals actively support or oppose the challenge at the state level?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	9
No	4

---

26. What was the final decision with regard to the challenged material?

Responses	Frequency
Case still pending	—
Adopted as basal	11
Adopted as supplementary	1
Not adopted	3
Special edition required for state	—
Other	4

Respondents who checked "other" specified the following outcomes:
"All were adopted."
"Changes required."

---

27. Did court action result from the challenge?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	--
No	14

Though respondents indicated that none of the cited recent challenges (since September 1, 1978) resulted in court action, they stated (during follow-up phone interviews) that court actions had resulted from somewhat earlier challenges, and that legislative action was prompted by some of the recent challenges (see question 28, below).

28. Have there been any other repercussions at the state level?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	2
No	12

The two respondents answering YES noted the following repercussions:

"The State Textbook Law was changed in 1980 to include three lay citizens as members of the State Textbook Commission. A resolution was [also] passed to study the state textbook selection process and possibly introduce other legislative changes in the 1981 session of the General Assembly."

"Fundamentalist groups have lobbied for the introduction of a bill in the State legislature requiring that equal time be given to the teaching of their views in the schools. The bill was killed in committee last year, but will be presented again this year."

29. In your view, have such challenges affected the educational process in your state?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	5
No	--
Not certain	--

IF YES, how? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Frequency
Influenced content and/or style of teaching	2
Influenced selection of materials	6
Altered students' attitudes toward materials	--
Other(s) _____ (Please specify)	5

[NOTE: Responses for the second part of this question total more than 5 because some respondents reported on more than one challenge.]

Other repercussions specified by respondents were the following:
"Made people more aware of importance of instructional material."
"Created bad publicity and adverse opinions about textbooks and education in general."
"Influenced material submitted for adoption." [I.e., Publishers have been influenced to change material.]

---

30. PLEASE INDICATE IF A COPY OF YOUR STATE'S ADOPTION POLICY IS ENCLOSED OR UNAVAILABLE.

Responses	Frequency
Enclosed	19
Unavailable	2

The states which did not have current adoption policy statements when the survey questionnaire was circulated were Tennessee and New Mexico. The respondent from Tennessee noted that a policy based on the ALA model will be approved this year. The respondent from New Mexico stated that they were in the process of revising their adoption handbook. Both participants said they would send copies of their guidelines when available. (New Mexico's handbook has since been received.)

The remaining 19 respondents sent copies of their state guidelines, policies, and procedures governing book and materials adoption. These are in the possession of the AAP.

NOTES

1. See the ERS Report by Linda H. Kunder, Procedures for Textbook and Instructional Materials Selection (Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1976). The ERS survey included five states (California, Florida, Nevada, Virginia, and West Virginia) in the open category which are considered adoption states here. While these states do evaluate and recommend textbooks, ERS judged that they allowed for greater choice at the local levl than the other adoption states.

The one question in the ERS survey which pertained to challenges to materials read as follows: "Has your school district recently had a problem with persons or groups in your communty objecting to or challenging the appropriateness of: (a) textbooks and instructional materials? (b) supplementary materials? If YES, when was the last time that such an objection or challenge occurred?"

In addition, the ERS questionnaire included this item regarding reconsideration procedures: "Does your school district have written procedures for dealing with or responding to persons or groups who object to or challenge the appropriateness of textbooks and instructional materials that have been approved for use in schools?"

2. See Lee Burress, "A Brief Report of the 1977 NCTE Censorship Survey," in Dealing with Censorship, edited by James E. Davis (Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1979), pp. 14-47.

3. It may be of interest to some readers to compare this figure with the rates of challenges reported in earlier studies. Both the ERS and NCTE surveys reported higher rates, but a number of factors may have contributed to the disparity.

In the ERS survey, of 414 respondents (all district-level, open-state), 26.3 percent indicated they had had recent "challenges" or "objections" to instructional or supplementary materials. That figure is almost seven points higher than the 19.4 percent rate reported by administrators from the "open" states in the present survey. The ERS sampling may have been a contributing factor. (The ERS report notes that "selected" school districts were surveyed, but does not specify the methods or criteria used in the selection.) The ERS respondents also differed from the AAP-ALA-ASCD population on the question of reconsideration procedures: two-thirds of the ERS respondents (as compared with only half of the administrators in the present survey) reported that they have such procedures; and, as summarized in "Limiting What Students Shall Read," p. 6, the AAP-ALA-ASCD survey findings suggest that administrators with policies and procedures experience more challenges than administrators without them.

Another factor which may partly explain the lower reported rate of challenges in the present survey is that the term "challenges," the only term used in the AAP-ALA-ASCD questionnaire suggests graver problems than mere "objections" and may have led to an underreporting of challenges by respondents.

The NCTE survey reported substantially higher rates of censorship than the present survey. To quote the report by Lee Burress (in Dealing with Censorship, p. 16): "Approximately 49 percent of the returns indicated some kind of attempted or completed censorship, when all four basic categories [books, periodicals, AV materials, and school publications] are considered. If book censorship alone is considered, the 1977 survey shows that slighty over 30 percent of the returns reported book censorship pressures."

Like the ERS questionnaire, the NCTE instrument used the term "objections." (The key question in the NCTE survey read: "Have you or teachers in your department, since September 1, 1975, and the present [sic], had objections to a book or book title you are using?")

Essential differences between the populations surveyed undoubtedly contributed to the disparity between NCTE and present survey results. As the responses to the AAP-ALA-ASCD questionnaire indicate, library materials, upper grade materials, and contemporary fiction and nonfiction trade books (which are widely used in high school English classes) are particularly susceptible to censorship pressures. The AAP-ALA-ASCD sample, however, did not include classroom teachers, was skewed toward administrators rather than librarians, and was somewhat skewed toward lower rather than upper grades. In addition, a substantial number of challenges reported in the NCTE survey related to school publications (newspapers and creative writing publications), which were not specifically addressed in the principal items on the AAP-ALA-ASCD questionnaires.

APPENDIX A

Cover Letter for Local-Level Questionnaire

Association of American Publishers, Inc.

aap

One Park Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10016
Telephone 212 689-8920

April 25, 1980

Librarian:

Dear School Administrator:

About a week ago you should have received an advance letter urging your cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaire. As that letter explained, this survey is the first phase of a major study — which we at AAP are cosponsoring with the American Library Association and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development — on a process vital to education: the selection of books and instructional materials in our nation's public schools.

From this study we hope will come a report containing valuable data on the broad spectrum of factors influencing the selection process, as well as suggestions for resolving the conflicting pressures upon that process.

To attain our goal, we need to know what *your* experience has been in this sensitive area. Your response to this questionnaire — along with that of other school administrators and school librarians across the nation — is essential to the success of our endeavor.

Please take the time from your busy schedule to complete the enclosed questionnaire. (All responses will be kept in strictest confidence.) By cooperating in our research effort, you will bring us a step closer to our goal of providing you with a report which we trust will be of substantial practical value to you in your work.

Please return your completed questionnaire to us *no later than May 30, 1980,* so that we can proceed on schedule with this important study.

With hearty thanks for your support and cooperation,

Sincerely,

Townsend Hoopes

Townsend Hoopes
President

APPENDIX B

Local Newspaper Account of School Censorship Attempt

The following article from the Oneida (New York) Daily Dispatch, February 28, 1980, was sent to the AAP by a survey respondent.

"NOVELS DEFENDED BY VVS TEACHERS"

by JOAN WART
Dispatch Staff Writer

VERNON - Teachers and administrators at Vernon-Verona-Sherrill High School Wednesday defended the use of several novels the Rev. Carl Hadley says should be removed from the required reading lists.

Hadley, pastor of the Beacon Light Baptist Church, has criticized a number of novels used at the school and called for their removal because they contain what he describes as "trash." Among the books Hadley wants banned are, "A Separate Peace", by John Knowles; "To Kill a Mocking Bird", by Harper Lee; "The Red Pony", "Grapes of Wrath", and "Of Mice and Men", by John Steinbeck; "It's Not the End of the World", by Judy Blume; and A "Farewell to Arms", by Ernest Hemingway.

However, teachers at the school say there is merit in all the books Hadley wants eliminated from English classes. There are also formal procedures for placing books on required reading lists and for registering a complaint if a student or parent finds a particular selection objectionable, teachers said.

Hadley had criticized the novels for containing swear words and condoning rebelliousness in young people. As substitutes, he recommended that the "Lassie" series and the "Black Beauty" series of books be included in required reading for the high school students.

However, "Lassie" and "Black Beauty" would fall beneath the material level for high school students, said Dr. Thomas Morgan, VVS High School Principal.

According to Mrs. Callahan, VVS library and media specialist, "Lassie", "is a lovely book and appeals to fourth and fifth graders but most junior high students would not be interested in it."

"The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn," by Mark Twain, according to Morgan, can be taught as an adventure story in fifth grade, as well as a social commentary of the times in college.

"As with great works it has different levels and that way it's great," said Morgan. "Lassie is a nice dog story, which is a nice dog story, which is a nice dog story," he added.

Hadley previously said he did not like "A Separate Peace," because it was about rebelliousness in young people and taught disrespect for authority.

According to the chairman of the English department, John Dudus, the book doesn't condone it, but only says it exists. No teacher would condone it in class, he said, because the teacher would then have to deal with it.

In reference to the books containing "swear" words, Dudus said, the author is not condoning swearing, but only saying it exists.

Morgan said great literature and life intertwine. The books show what exists, instead of what should be.

"If knowledge is always translated into action, man would have blown the world up long ago," Morgan said.

The criteria for choosing a book in the library, according to Mrs. Callahan, is by first reading the titles recommended in the school library journals and English journals, and then, especially on fiction books, reading 2 to 3 reviews of the book before purchasing it.

According to English department chairman John Dudus, the majority of the books are already on the cirriculum. New textbooks are seen in the English Journal and have to be approved by the school board. Also grades 7 through 12 have Tab and Read scholastic books which they can volunteer to buy. Other reading is suggested or required for each grade level.

The majority of problems related to book selection are settled by the individual teacher and student, said Mrs. Callahan. If a student objects to a particular book, a book is substituted which has the same theme as the one being taught in the section of the course. The student is sent to the library during class time because the feeling is if he objects to the book he would probably object to the classroom discussion, said Mrs. Callahan.

If a parent wishes to make a formal complaint to the school about the reading material in a class he has to fill out a form requiring him to read the book, said Morgan.

Some of the questions the parent must answer are: "Did you read the entire book? If not, what parts? Do you know the purpose for which this book was assigned? If so, please state the purpose. Are you evaluating this book in the light of the purpose for which this material was selected? What do you feel might be the result of reading this book? In its place, what more appropriate material of equal or better quality would you recommend that would meet the objective? Have you had an opportunity to review the opinion of literary or subject area specialists concerning this material?

According to Morgan, "It is our professional responsibility to make decisions for kids. It's a "Catch 22" if the person criticizing is not well-read himself. He is forced to trust the person under attack or a vacuum is created."

Morgan was a former English teacher, received his bachelor's degree and master's degree from Columbia University and wrote his master's thesis on Hemingway. Morgan said he had come up against this conflict before when teaching, but this will be only the third official complaint.

If a complaint is filed a committee is formed of teachers, community members and administrators to review the complaint and the book.

APPENDIX C

Letter to AAP from Local School Administrator

7 May 1980

Mr. Townsend Hoopes
One Park Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10016

Dear Mr. Hoopes:

I just completed the questionnaire on book selection and was very pleased to have the opportunity to respond. While the school that I am presently associated with has not had any book selection problems I recently was involved in an extensive book selection controversy.

I have been in my present position for only nine months, however, two years ago I was principal of Vergennes Union High School, Vergennes, Vermont. During my tenure as principal of the school we became deeply embroiled in a book selection controversy for the school library. At the time, we had no policy and in cooperation with citizens we tried to establish a policy along with a process for someone to challenge a work chosen for the library. Unfortunately the committee became a vehicle for an arch conservative group that had religious ties. I fought long and hard with the librarian to establish a selection policy in keeping with the ALA's recommendations. A policy was established that did preserve the integrity of the concept of intellectual freedom.

The need for the policy was prompted by a parent who objected to a book titled Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas by Hunter S. Thompson. With the policy in place a series of books were challenged and became involved in a community wide censorship storm. The books were Wanderers, Richard Price; Dog Day Afternoon, from the film; and Forever, Judy Blume.

It is important to note that the librarian, Ms. Beth Phillips, was joined by a student and faculty group and some parents in a suit. The American Civil Liberties Union is representing the librarian, the students and parents. The case is being appealed since the first decision, as expected, went in favor of the school board.

Because of the courageous stand taken by Ms. Phillips the American Library Association is honoring her with the John Phillip Immroth Award this July in New York. As fate would have it the luncheon where the award will be made will feature Judy Blume as the speaker.

If I can assist in your study in any way further than questionnaire, please contact me. I am Vice President of the state affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, one of the national sponsors of your study. If we can help please let us know.

Sincerely,

James M. Fitzpatrick
Associate Principal
Champlain Valley Union High School
Hinesburg, Vermont

APPENDIX D

Letter to AAP from State-Adoption Administrator

TENNESSEE
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Textbook Services
130 Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

July 2, 1980

Mr. Townsend Hoopes
Association of American Publishers
One Park Avenue
New York, New York 10016

Dear Mr. Hoopes:

I am pleased to see that the Association of American Publishers is responding to what we in Tennessee see as the beginning of a powerful movement by the "New Right" to dismantle the public education system. Perhaps I am over-reacting to this situation, but it represents a continuing source of concern by many educators here and across the nation. I am forwarding copies of two recent articles from professional journals which may provide some further information on the New Right and its objectives.

When your survey arrived I discussed it with Miss Christine Brown, Program Manager for Libraries and Media Services, and we agreed that since we do not have a state approved list of library books, our responses would apply only to textbooks. In completing the survey, I felt that instead of trying to respond about each complaint, it would be easier to enclose a copy of each evaluation submitted by the Pro-Family Forum.

If I can be of further service please contact me.

Sincerely yours,

R. Jerry Rice, Director
Textbook Services